C. 2.

Dr. BENTLEY's DISSERTATIONS ON THE *Epiſtles of* PHALARIS, AND THE Fables of ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D

By the Honourable

Charles Boyle, Eſq;

—— *Remember* Milo's *End*;
Wedg'd in that Timber which he ſtrove to rend.
Roſcom. Eſſ. of Tranſl. Verſ.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,
Printed for *Tho. Bennet*, at the *Half-moon* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*. 1698.

Ex dono Christophori Hales Baronetti
1708

Mr Bennet,

Paris, Apr. 16th *N.S.*

I Thank you for the Care you have taken of the Impreſſion. However, ſome ſlight Miſtakes I find are committed, which, if you think fit to make a Second Edition of my book, I deſire may be rectify'd; and the few following alterations obſerv'd.

Your humble Servant,

C. Boyle.

THE PREFACE.

SOON after Dr. Bentley's *Diſſertation came out, I was call'd away into* Ireland, *to attend the Parliament there. The Publick Buſineſs, and my own private affairs, detain'd me a great while in that Kingdom, elſe the World ſhould have had a much Earlier account of Him, and his Performance. For tho' He took above two Years to make his Learned Reflections on* Phalaris; *yet Two Months would have been enough to have ſhown him, that he is but a weak Champion in a very frivolous Cauſe.*

I ſpeak not this out of any vain deſign of ſetting up for a Quick Writer, but meerly to avoid being thought to have thrown away any conſiderable part of my life upon ſo trifling a ſubject: which, as Idle a man as I am, is an Imputation I would not willingly lye under.

I little imagin'd ever to have been engag'd in a Diſpute of this nature. I am not over-fond of Controverſie even where the Points debated may be thought of ſome importance; but in trivial matters, and ſuch as Mankind is not at all concern'd in, methinks it is unpardonable. This, ever ſince I came to have any Opinions of my own, has been one of 'em; and is ſtill, tho' I am unluckily at preſent brought to act contrary to it. But the Caſe is this — Dr Bentley *has been pleas'd, with ſome warmth, to fall foul on an Edition and Verſion of* Phalaris's Epiſtles, *that*

that I ſome years ſince offer'd to the World. He has taken a great deal of Good-natur'd pains to prove, that I had been very fooliſhly buſying my ſelf upon a Contemptible and Spurious Author; and had made a bad book much worſe by a very ill Edition of it. I was very Young, when I appear'd on that occaſion; and I appear'd rather as one that wiſh'd well to Learning than profeſs'd it; and for both theſe reaſons promis'd my ſelf good uſage from the men of more profound Skill in ſuch matter. Dr Bentley *was ſenſible that his Criticiſms would lye under ſome diſadvantage on this account; and therefore, to excuſe his making ſo free with the Edition, was pleas'd to make yet freer with Me; and, according to His Breeding, to tell Me, and all the World, that I had ſet my name to a Book, which did not belong to me.*

The firſt of theſe Reflections, had it come ſingle, I could eaſily have neglected: had he ſtop'd there, I would have left the Book to ſhift for it ſelf, and Him to the good opinion he has of his own performances, without endeavouring to leſſen it. But when he carried his Criticiſms ſo far as to aſſert, not only of Phalaris, *but his* Editor *too, that they neither of 'em wrote what was aſcrib'd to 'em; he gave me ſo plain, and ſo publick an Affront, that I could not, with any tolerable regard to my reputation, quietly put it up. Thus was I, much againſt my inclinations, brought into the Liſts. It was neceſſary for me to ſay ſomething in defence of my Self; and when I did ſo, I thought it would be judg'd proper for me to ſay ſomething too in defence of my Author; and to enquire into the juſtneſs of thoſe Criticiſms which Dr* Bentley *has advanc'd on this occaſion; and which, I foreſaw, wou'd be look'd upon, as in ſome meaſure aim'd at Me, tho' they did not really belong to me.*

I have not any where in my Book asſerted, that the Epiſtles, *which carry* Phalaris's *name, are Genuine; and I am not therefore engag'd to defend their Reputation againſt the Attacks of Dr* Bentley, *or any other perſon, who, by the help of Leiſure and Lexicons, ſhall ſet up for a Critic in this point. But as I have not undertaken for their being Genuine; ſo neither have I, with a deciſive and aſſuming air, pronounc'd 'em Spurious. I expreſs'd my ſelf with that Caution and Reſerve in this matter, which I thought became a Young Writer, who was ſenſible, that the beſt and ableſt Judges were divided in their opinions about it; and I thought it would be a very Indecent part in Me, to make my ſelf a Judge between 'em.*

But I was chiefly induc'd to obſerve theſe meaſures, by the Regard I had for the moſt Accompliſh'd Writer of the Age, *whom I never think of, without calling to mind thoſe happy Lines of* Lucretius,

Quem Tu, Dea, Tempore in omni
Omnibus ornatum voluiſti excellere rebus.

a Character, which, I dare ſay, Memmius *did not better deſerve than Sir* William Temple. *He had openly declar'd in favour of the Epiſtles: and the Nicety of his Taſte was never, I think, diſputed by Such as had any themſelves. I quoted his Words with that reſpect which is due to ev'ry thing that comes from him: but muſt now beg his pardon for it; for I have by this means, I find, drawn him into a ſhare of Dr* Bentley's *diſpleaſure: who has hereupon given himſelf the trouble of writing almoſt fourſcore pages ſolemnly to diſprove that One of Sir* William's *which he has prefix'd to his Appendix; and which, to give him my opinion of his*

whole

whole Book at once, is the only good Page there.

I am therefore the rather inclin'd to give Dr Bentley's *Reflections a Due Examination, on Sir* William Temple's *account; upon whom I ſo unhappily occaſion'd this Storm of Criticiſm to fall. In truth, for a Man who has been ſo great an Ornament to Learning, he has had ſtrange uſage from Some who are Retainers to it. He had ſet the world a Pattern of mixing Wit with Reaſon, Sound Knowledge with Good Manners; and of making the one ſerve to recommend and ſet off the other; but his Copy has not been at all follow'd by thoſe that have writ againſt him, in a very rough way, and without that Reſpect which was due both to His Character, and their Own.*

I will not pretend to determine, on which ſide, in thoſe Diſputes, the Truth lies; only thus much I will venture to ſay of 'em, that, let Sir W. T. *be as much out in ſome of his Opinions as he's repreſented to be, yet They, who read both ſides, will be apt to fall in with* Tully's *Opinion of* Plato, *and ſay,* Cum Illo Ego mehercle errare malim quàm cum iſtis Scriptoribus vera ſentire. *I had rather be ſo Handſomly miſtaken as He is, if he be miſtaken, than be ſo Rudely and Dully in the right, as Some of his Oppoſers, allowing 'em to be in the right, are.*

There was alſo another Conſideration that determin'd me to write. Dr Bentley's *Reflections were underſtrod to go further than either Sir* William Temple, *or my Self; and to be levell'd at a* Learned Society, *in which I had the happineſs to be educated: and which Dr* Bentley *is ſuppos'd to attack under thoſe General Terms of* Our New Editors, Our Annotators, *and* Thoſe Great Genius's with whom Learning, that is leaving the world, has taken up her laſt Reſidence.

By

By these, and such expressions as these, with which his Familiar Epistle abounds, he would insinuate as if Phalaris, *as slight a piece as it is, had been made up by contribution from several hands, and were the Joint Work of that Eminent Body. But in this he does me too great an honour; and I'm almost tempted to take it, as* Terence *did the agreeable Reproach of* Lœlius *and* Scipio's *writing his Plays for him; neither to own nor deny it. But* Terence *wrote what might have become those Noble Pens; and therefore did no injury to their Reputation when he favour'd that mistake: whereas I shou'd be extreamly to blame, if I shou'd suffer a Report to spread to the disadvantage of so many Excellent Men. I think my self therefore oblig'd to declare, that whatever the Faults of* Phalaris *are, they are Mine; and I alone am answerable for them. There is a very Deserving Gentleman indeed, who had a little before been the Director of my Studies, and was then My Particular Friend, to whom I have acknowledgments to make on this occasion. I consulted him upon any difficulty, because I thought it not proper for one of my Age to offer any thing to the Public without consulting Some-body. I wish I had advis'd oftener with him, for then my Book would have been much more correct. But excepting Him, no one had a hand in it; nay, scarce a line was ever seen by any-body else as I know of, till it was finish'd. And now I have confess'd thus much, I don't care if I own a little further to Dr* Bentley, *that I have been again oblig'd to the Same person for his Assistance in consulting some Books in the* Oxford Libraries *at my request, which in the Places where I have been, were not at all, or not easily, to be met with. The Dr may make what advantages of this he thinks fit; I assure him, I will never recriminate;*

for

for I declare to the World, that I ſincerely believe the Dr's Diſſertation is entirely his own, both as to Matter and Dreſs; and that no Friend whatever, no not Mr Wotton *himſelf, had any hand in it. The happy Genius of ſome Authors will for ever ſecure 'em from all Scandals of this nature:* Terence *indeed was ſuſpected, but* Bavius *and* Mœvius *never were. Dr* Bentley *has induſtriouſly contriv'd to lead his Reader into this miſtake; imagining, I ſuppoſe, that the Conqueſt would have been too cheap for a man of his Rank in Letters, unleſs he engag'd, like the Hero of a Romance, with great numbers at once. But ſome men have thought themſelves Heroes that were not, and ſome that were, have miſtaken their Strength; and in either of theſe caſes have come off but ſcurvily. The Dr, I'm ſure, would have been made very ſenſible of this in the preſent Debate, had not I been kinder to him than He was to Himſelf, and ſtept in, as I thought it became me, between Him and the juſt reſentments of that Learned Body. 'Twere pity that any of thoſe worthy Men, who know ſo well how to employ their hours, ſhould be diverted from the purſuit of Uſeful Knowledge, into ſuch Trivial Enquiries as theſe. The Diſpute began between Dr* Bentley, *and Me; and 'tis fit that We Two ſhould end it.*

I have a Requeſt to Such as ſhall give themſelves the Trouble of peruſing Theſe Papers, that they would do Me, *and Dr* Bentley, *the Juſtice to compare 'em, Paragraph by Paragraph, with His Diſſertations. The Task is a little unreaſonable, conſidering the Length of the Diſpute; but 'tis neceſſary, in order to form a true judgment of the Performance.*

Dr

Dr. BENTLEY'S Diſſertation UPON THE Epiſtles of *Phalaris*, &c. EXAMIN'D

DR *Bentley*, in the Piece I am about to examine, among ſeveral other Liberties, has taken this, of writing without any Method. Great Genius's indeed are above ordinary Rules: but it wou'd ill become ſo unknown a Writer as I am, to exempt my ſelf from 'em; and therefore I ſhall obſerve a method in anſwering him.

I think moſt of the ſcatter'd Remarks he has made, in that particular Diſſertation which relates to *Phalaris*, will come under one of theſe Three Heads; They are either ſome *Arguments*, which he has urged for the *Spuriouſneſs* of the *Epiſtles*; or ſome *Faults* which he has found with my *Edition* and *Verſion* of 'em; or ſome *Matters of Fact*

which he has related, as the Grounds of his peeviſh Quarrel.

Theſe laſt he has thrown into an odd corner of his Book, as it were out of ſight; and plac'd 'em in the Rear of all his Learned Arguments. One wou'd imagine, by the Poſt he has given 'em, that he diſtruſted their ſtrength; or that he wrote his Book firſt, and found Reaſons for it afterwards. However that may be, I think my ſelf oblig'd to clear up this Point in the firſt place, by ſetting thoſe *Matters of Fact* in their true light, which Dr *Bentley* has extreamly diſguis'd: and then 'twill be time to conſider the *Wonderful Proofs* he has produc'd on his ſide, and the *Mighty Miſtakes* he has thought fit to charge me with.

About four or five Years ago, the worthy Dean of *Chriſtchurch*, Dr *Aldrich* (of whoſe College I was then a Member) deſir'd me to undertake an Edition of *Phalaris*. I cou'd deny Him nothing, to whom I ow'd ſo much; and therefore, as unfit as I thought my ſelf for ſuch a Task, I undertook it. In order to it, a Manuſcript *Phalaris* in the *King's Library* was to be conſulted. It was of no Age or Worth, I heard, being written but juſt before the reſtauration of Letters; however it was a Manuſcript, and therefore not to be neglected; eſpecially ſince we had no ancient Copies, either in *England*, or any where elſe, that I cou'd hear of. I ſent to Mr *Bennet*, my Bookſeller in *London*, to get the Manuſcript, and deſir'd him to apply himſelf to Dr

Dr *Bentley*, in my name, for the uſe of it; not doubting in the leaſt a ready complyance with ſuch a requeſt, from one of his Station and Order; and who beſides was at that very time in a Lecture of ſome Honour and Profit that had lately been ſet up by one of my Relations: eſpecially, ſince the Book, which I deſir'd to borrow, was of ſo little importance, that it had ſcarce been a Favour to have lent it me, if I had not ask'd it. After an Expectation of many months, Mr *Bennet* ſent me at laſt a Collation of part of the Manuſcript, with this account; that he had, with great difficulty, and after long delays, got the Manuſcript into his hands; that he had it but a very few days, when Dr *Bentley* came to demand it again; and wou'd, by no means, be prevail'd upon to let him have the uſe of it any longer, tho' he told him, the Collation was not perfected: and that he deny'd this Requeſt in a very rude manner, throwing out ſeveral ſlight and diſparaging Expreſſions, both of Me, and the Work I was about.

This I had reaſon to take very ill of Dr *Bentley*, and therefore in that part of my *Preface*, where I gave an account of the MSS that were conſulted in that Edition, I inſerted theſe words, [*Collatas etiam curavi uſque ad Epiſtolam* 40 *cum* MS° *in Bibliothecâ Regiâ; cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro ſingulari ſuâ humanitate, negavit.*] which, conſidering the uſage I had had from him, was as ſoft a thing as I con'd well allow my ſelf to ſay. The Epiſtles were no ſooner publiſh'd, but Dr *Bently* ſent me a Letter;

wherein, after expreſſing himſelf with great civility to me, he repreſented the Matter of fact quite otherwiſe than I had heard it. I return'd him immediately as civil an Anſwer, to this effect: That Mr *Bennet*, whom I employ'd to wait on him in my name, gave me ſuch an account of his Reception, that I had reaſon to apprehend my ſelf affronted: and, ſince I cou'd make no other excuſe to my Reader, for not collating the King's MS but becauſe 'twas deny'd me, I thought I cou'd do no leſs than expreſs ſome reſentment of that Denial. That I ſhou'd be very much concern'd if Mr *Bennet* had dealt ſo ill with me, as to miſlead me in his accounts; and, if that appear'd, ſhou'd be ready to take ſome opportunity of begging his pardon: and, as I remember, I expreſs'd my ſelf ſo, that the Dr might underſtand, I meant to give him ſatisfaction as publickly as I had injur'd him. Here the matter reſted, and I thought Dr *Bentley* was ſatisfied; eſpecially, ſince I found Mr *Bennet* perſiſted in his account, and ſupported it with further proofs; and the Dr ſeem'd willing to let the Diſpute drop, by his not writing to me any further about it, or diſcourſing Mr *Bennet* concerning it, to whom my Letter plainly refer'd him. In this Miſtake was I, for Two Years and an half after the Edition of *Phalaris*; till at laſt Dr *Bentley*'s Diſſertation came out, and convinc'd me, that he had had Vengeance in his Heart all the time, and ſuſpended his Blow only till he cou'd ſtrike, as he thought, to purpoſe. In this angry Diſcourſe of his, he tells the World the ſame ſtory (bating a Circumſtance

cumſtance or two which he has alter'd) that he had told me before in his Letter. His words are theſe: *A Bookſeller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg the uſe of the Manuſcript. It was not then in my cuſtody: but as ſoon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily and offer'd it him, bidding him tell the Collator not to loſe any time; for I was ſhortly to go out of Town for two Months. 'Twas deliver'd, us'd, and return'd: Not a word ſaid by the Bearer, nor the leaſt ſuſpicion in me, that they had not finiſh'd the Collation.* Diſſ. p. 66.

Startled at theſe Aſſertions thus reviv'd, after a long Silence, and improv'd in Print, I examin'd Mr *Bennet* again very ſtrictly and particularly. He aſſur'd me, that every word he had writ to me upon this occaſion was punctually true; and that Dr *Bentley*'s account, where it differ'd from his, was entirely falſe. He drew up the Matter of Fact in writing, and ſet his Hand to it; giving me liberty to make it publick, and to aſſure the World, that he was ready to juſtifie the truth of what he had written with his Oath, when it ſhou'd be duly requir'd of him. He added, that Mr *Gibſon*, the Collator, cou'd confirm ſome circumſtances of his Account; and that his Brother (who was his Apprentice at that time, and was ſent by him both to Dr *Bentley*, and to the Collator) wou'd have atteſt'd the Truth of the whole, had he been alive; but he dy'd ſome Months after this Matter happen'd. However, if his own Teſtimony, and the Collators, ſhou'd be liable to Suſpicion, yet ſtill there was a Gentleman of known Credit in the World,

Dr King *of the Commons*, who was witneſs to all that paſs'd at one meeting, between him and Dr *Bentley*; and wou'd, he hop'd, be ſo juſt to him as to give an account of it. He was not miſtaken; for Dr *King* being apply'd to by a Friend of mine, preſently wrote him the following Letter, which together with the ſeveral Certificates of Mr *Bennet* and Mr *Gibſon*, I here offer to the Reader.

WHereas the Reverend Dr Bentley *has thought fit, in the* Appendix *to Mr.* Woton's *Reflections on Ancient and Modern Learning*, (*p.* 66, *&* 67.) *to inſert the following words as Matter of Fact*, [*viz.* A Bookſeller came to me in the name of the Editors, *&c.*] *I think my ſelf oblig'd to give the World the following account, wherein I have faithfully related what paſſed on that occaſion.*

See the Paſſage at length, *p.* 5.

I was imploy'd by the Honourable Mr Boyle, (*and by him only*) *to borrow the MS of* Phalaris *from Dr* Bentley. *After about* Nine Months *ſollicitation, it was deliver'd into my cuſtody, without any time limited for the return of it. Within* few days *after*, *Dr* Bentley *call'd upon me, to have it reſtor'd, and Then told me, that he was to go into the Country. He ſtaid till I ſent to the Collator, and word was brought by the Meſſenger,* that it was not collated. *I then beg'd him to let me have it but till Sunday Morning*, (*it was Saturday Noon when he came*) *and I engag'd to oblige the Collator to ſit up all Saturday Night, to get it finiſh'd. But he utterly refus'd to leave it with me any longer, demanding to have it ſent that Day to* Weſtminſter, (*which was done accordingly*) *and not giving me any the leaſt hopes, that*

that if I apply'd to him upon his return out of the Country, I ſhou'd have leave to get the Collation perfected. Theſe Circumſtances I am thus particular in, becauſe I had occaſion to recollect 'em not long afterwards, when Mr Boyle's *Book came out, and Letters paſs'd between him and Dr* Bentley, *concerning the Paſſage in his Preface.*

It may not be proper, conſidering my Imployment, for me to add an account of the Reflections Dr Bentley *was pleas'd to make from time to time, when I ſpoke to him from Mr* Boyle, *for the Uſe of the MS. He has repreſented me as having ſaid too much on that ſubject. But, by good fortune, Dr* King *was preſent at one of the Meetings, and heard all that paſs'd there. I hope he will do Juſtice on this occaſion.*

July 13. 1697. Thomas Bennet.

I Very well remember, that Mr Bennet *ſent his Man to me for* Phalaris's Epiſtles, *whilſt I was collating 'em; and being unwilling to part with them, before I had gone through 'em, I ſent the Man back without them. But he preſently return'd, and told me, that the Gentleman, that own'd them, ſtaid at their Shop for them, and cou'd not ſpare them any longer: This is the true reaſon, why I cou'd collate no more of the aboveſaid Epiſtles.*

Witneſs my Hand,

July 15. 1697. Geo. Gibſon.

SIR,

I Am bound in Juſtice to anſwer your requeſt, by endeavouring, as far as I can, to recollect what paſs'd between Mr Bennet *and Dr* Bentley, *concerning a MS of the Epiſtles of* Phalaris. *I cannot be certain as to any other particulars, than that, among other things, the Dr ſaid, that* if the MS were collated, it wou'd be worth nothing for the future: *Which I took the more notice of, becauſe I thought a MS good for nothing, unleſs it were collated. The whole Diſcourſe was manag'd with ſuch inſolence, that, after he was gone, I told Mr* Bennet, *that he ought to ſend Mr* Boyle *word of it: that, for my own part, (I ſaid then, what I think ſtill) I did not believe that the Various Readings of any Book were ſo much worth, as that a Perſon of Mr* Boyle's *Honour and Learning, ſhou'd be us'd ſo ſcurvily to obtain 'em. That ſcorn and contempt which I have naturally for Pride and Inſolence, makes me remember that, which otherwiſe I might have forgot. Believe me, Sir, to be*

Your faithful Friend,

and humble Servant,

William King.

Doctors Commons, Octob. 13. 1697.

The

The Caſe then between Me and Dr *Bentley* ſtands thus: There is, on the one ſide, Dr *Bentley*'s ſingle Aſſertion, in his own cauſe; and theſe ſeveral concurring Accounts, from Perſons of Probity and Worth, on the other. The queſtion now is (if it be a queſtion) which of theſe ought to be credited; the Point to me is ſo clear, that I dare truſt the moſt partial Friend Dr *Bentley* has to determine it.

Mr *Bennet*, and Mr *Gibſon*, I think, are ſo little intereſted in this Diſpute, that they may be entirely depended upon. However, Dr *King* is a Witneſs without Exception; and the account he gives of one of thoſe *Free Conferences* Dr *Bentley* held with Mr *Bennet*, is full and home; and I do aſſure our Learned Critic, that what ever becomes of *Phalaris*'s Letters, this of Dr *King*'s is not Spurious. I have the Original of it by me under his own hand, as I have the Originals too of the other Papers, which ſhall be at Dr. *Bentley*'s, or any man's ſervice, that pleaſes to command a ſight of 'em.

And now had I not reaſon to ſay what I did, and much more than I did, of Dr *Bentley*, in my Preface to *Phalaris*? Cou'd I reſent the harſh Treatment he had given me in Gentler Terms than I there made uſe of? Since he had denyed me ſo common a favour, and ſpoken of me with ſo much contempt, I was at Liberty, I think, to have return'd his Civilities in what way I pleas'd; and to have given him any Language whatever that it was not below me to give: And that

that is a Reſtraint which, I hope, I ſhall always be able to lay upon my ſelf, whatever the Provocation be.

Dr *Bentley* then, conſidering all things, was really oblig'd to me, for uſing him with ſo much Tenderneſs. What way did he take of owning his Obligations? He immediately enter'd upon the Honourable and Chriſtian Deſign of expoſing me; and reſolv'd, whatever Time or Pains it might coſt him, to prove, that the Epiſtles I had put out were a ridiculous Cheat; and that I (or whoever the Editor was) was to be pity'd, for giving my ſelf ſo much trouble about them.

I ſee Monſieur *Rochfaucault* drew his Obſervation from Nature, when he ſaid, *We often pardon thoſe that injure us, but we can never forgive thoſe that we injure.*

In about two or three years time he had atchiev'd this mighty Work, and compaſs'd a Diſſertation as big as *Phalaris* it ſelf, to make his Point good. There, that he might be wanting in no Inſtance of *Humanity*, he tells the World, that the Edition of *Phalaris* was not mine, but only *aſcrib'd* to me; and, be it whoſe it would, that 'twas a faulty and a fooliſh one: and then tells Me too, in the ſame breath, that nothing of this was *intended as a diſparagement to me*; to ſhow his Reader, I ſuppoſe, that he had as mean an Opinion of my Underſtanding, as he had of my Learning. He names me not indeed, but in his civil way of Circumlocution, calls me, *That young Gentleman of great hopes whoſe Name is ſet to the Edition.* But what great hopes cou'd the World have had of a young Gentleman,

man, who ſhou'd have ſuffer'd the Lye to be publickly given him, in a matter, where his Reputation, both as a Scholar and a Man of Honour, was nearly concern'd, and yet had either not Senſe enough to diſcern the Affront, or not Spirit enough to reſent it?

Dr *Bentley* was not ſatisfied with giving me ill Uſage, unleſs he did it in ill Words too; and therefore has cull'd out the very worſt he cou'd find, to beſtow on me: for ſurely no man of Liberal Education cou'd put together ſo many unmannerly and ſlovenly expreſſions without ſtudying for 'em. He charges me with *Calumny* [a], *weak Detraction* [a], *Injuſtice* [a], *Forgery* and *Slander* [a]; with the *baſeſt Tricks* [b], and a *vile Aſperſion* [b], He tells me, that a certain Perſon, *tho' a ſorry Critic, was as yet a degree above me* [c]; and, that *Printing is a Sword in the hand of a Child* [d]; meaning, I ſuppoſe, his humble Servant.

a p. 66.
b p. 71.
c p. 75.
d p. 67.

He likens me, by a very elegant Simily, to a *Bungling Tinker mending Old Kettles* [e], in one place; and by the help of a Greek Proverb, calls me downright *Aſs* [f] in another. The correcting the faults of my Verſion is, in his polite way of writing, *the cleanſing of* Augeas's *Stables* [g]; and, to carry on the Metaphor, he ſays, *The Firſt Epiſtle coſt him four Pages in ſcouring* [h].

e p. 76.
f p. 74.
g p. 73.
h *ibid.*

Theſe are the Flowers, which Dr *Bentley* has, with no very ſparing hand, ſtrew'd throughout every Page almoſt of his Learned Epiſtle. It can hardly be imagin'd, how one, that lives within the Air of a Court, ſhou'd prevail with himſelf to deal in ſuch dirty Language: the Chairmen at St *James*'s, I dare

dare ſay, manage their Diſputes with more decency. I find the Dr has not profited much by the dependence he once had on a *Great Man*, who might have taught him, wou'd he have vouchſaf'd to learn it, the Secret of engaging deep with an Adverſary, without Loſs of Temper, or Breach of Good Manners.

But he will tell me, that few, or none of theſe expreſſions were levell'd at Me; and that for a very obliging reaſon; becauſe I am not included among the *Editors* of *Phalaris*. Let 'em have been levell'd at whom he will, they are inexcuſable. Chew'd Bullets are not more againſt the Law of Arms, than ſuch ways of ſpeech are againſt the rules of good writing.

Dr *Bentley* cou'd not have taken a better way of juſtifying me in what I ſaid of him, than by writing in this manner he has done; and with ſo little of that *Humanity*, the want of which I objected to him. Moſt Readers will be apt to think, that he might probably always want it as much as they ſee he does now. So that if I needed further Vouchers than thoſe which I have already brought, I wou'd call in his own Diſſertation to witneſs for me, that I have not wrong'd him, nor given him any Character but what he has ſince been courteouſly pleas'd to make good.

But Our Critic appeals from me to more Equitable Judges; and tells me, that he *can produce ſeveral Letters from Learned Profeſſors abroad, (whoſe Books in time I may be fit to read) wherein theſe very ſame words* [pro ſingulari

ſuâ

ſuâ humanitate] *are ſaid of him ſeriouſly and candidly. For I endeavour* (ſays he) *to oblige even Foreigners by all Courteſie and Humanity; much more wou'd I encourage and aſſiſt any uſeful deſign at home.*

But why muſt we go to Foreign Nations for a true account of Dr *Bentley?* I thought Mens Characters had been beſt learnt from thoſe among whom they convers'd. The Law of *England* is, that every man ſhall be try'd by his Country and his Neighbourhood; and this is not more reaſonable in the Caſe of Life and Death, than in that of Reputation. But Dr *Bentley* pleads to have a Jury of Foreign Profeſſors impanell'd to ſit upon him: a very ſuſpicious Defence, I think; and which ought, without any more ado, to condemn him. Shou'd a man tax'd with ill breeding here at *London* (where he has liv'd all his time) produce Certificates in his behalf from ſome Correſpondents in *Cornwall*, or *Cumberland*, wou'd this Plea paſs at Court? Granting Dr *Bentley*'s Foreigners to have ſaid thoſe things of him which he ſays they have, 'tis becauſe they are Foreigners; We, that have the happineſs of a nearer converſation with him, know him better; and may perhaps take an opportunity of ſetting thoſe miſtaken Strangers right in their Opinions concerning him.

Thus much, upon the Suppoſition that he has theſe Teſtimonials by him: but I, who have had ſome dealings with him, have learnt a little to miſtruſt his accounts; and ſhall therefore, before I make any more Remarks upon this paſſage, tell the Reader a Story.

There

There was, not many Years ago, a Diſpute about a Point of Hiſtory, between an Ingenious Gentleman and a *Learned Prelate* of our Church, well known to Dr *Bentley*. When the Gentleman was at a loſs for Proofs, his laſt reſort always was to a certain Cheſt at *Ilcomkill*, where there were MSS, it ſeems, never ſeen by any body beſides himſelf, that prov'd every thing he had a mind to. This preſently put an end to the Controverſie: for there was no diſputing againſt Inviſible Authorities. How far this may be Dr *Bentley*'s caſe, and whether the Letters from Learned Profeſſors abroad, which he talks of, may not lye in ſome ſuch Cheſt as thoſe Records lay in, I will not pretend to determine. However, ſince they are MSS, I know his Fondneſs for thoſe precious Jewels ſo well, that I believe he'll be ſhy of making 'em publick. Till he does, the Printed Proofs that have been given of his great *Humanity* will ſtand good againſt what he tells us has been written to him.

Sure I am, there are ſome Learned Men abroad, that are far from Complimenting him. One of 'em, a Man of great note, has complain'd to me, how ill he has been us'd by him, in a Caſe nearly reſembling mine; and complain'd in very expreſſive Terms; which, not yet having his Leave for it, I do not think my ſelf at liberty to publiſh.

Another, that was deſirous to have a ſight of the *Alexandrian* MS, and apply'd himſelf to Dr *Bentley* very earneſtly for it, met with no other Anſwer to his Requeſt, but that *the Library was not fit to be ſeen*: A pretty Ex-

Excuſe for a Library-keeper to make, who had been four Years in that Service! And this Inſtance of his *Humanity*, I aſſure him, is of no Old date; it happen'd ſince he purg'd himſelf in his new Diſſertation, and gave Learned Men encouragement to expect better uſage.

If he goes on at this rate, as we have no reaſon to doubt but he will, Foreigners will begin to ſuſpect, whether we have, as we pretend, the *Alexandrian* MS, or indeed whether the King has any Library.

But becauſe the Dr ſtrongly argues from *his being ready to oblige even Foreigners by all Courteſie and Humanity*, that he wou'd *much more be ready to do ſo to Learned Men at Home*, I will add one Domeſtick Inſtance of his Courteſie too; that my Inſtances may be every way as large as his Aſſertions.

I have now a Letter by me under the hand of Sir *Edward Sherburn*, (a Gentleman of known Worth and Learning) wherein he has theſe words; *I have ſent* Rubenius's *Book*, [*de vitâ Mallii*, put out by *Grævius* in *Holland*, and dedicated to Dr *Bentley*] *the honour of whoſe Publication Mr* Bentley *hath ungratefully robb'd me of.* The meaning of this is explain'd in a Latin *Memorandum* enter'd by Sir *Edward* in the Book it ſelf; where he ſays, that *he put the MS into Dr* Bentley's *hands, under this Condition, that he ſhou'd ſend it to* Grævius *to be publiſh'd, letting him know from whence he had it, and deſiring him to make an honourable mention of him, as the perſon that had oblig'd the World with it. The Edition came out, it was dedicated to Dr* Bentley,

ley, *the honour of the Publication given to him; and not one word of Sir* Edward Sherburn *ſaid in it.* The Sophiſts are every where pelted by Dr *Bentley*, for putting out what they wrote in other mens names; but I did not expect to hear ſo loudly of it from one that has ſo far outdone 'em: For I think, 'tis much worſe to take the honour of another man's Book to one's ſelf, than to entitle ones own Book to another man.

But *Grævius*, it may be, was in fault; and forgot to do Sir *Edward Sherburn* juſtice. 'Tis hardly to be imagin'd he cou'd, had Dr *Bentley* told him plainly, that the MS was put into his hands under that expreſs Condition: But if the Dr only gave ſome ſlight intimation of it, *Grævius* might indeed forget to do what he did not know whether it were in good earneſt expected of him, or not.

But ſuppoſing the Original Omiſſion to have lain wholly at *Grævius*'s door, yet how came the Dr to be ſo very quiet under it afterwards? Why did he not ſend immediately to Sir *Edward Sherburn* to excuſe it? Why did he not take care to have this Neglect repair'd in the next *Holland* Journal? Nothing of this was done; and therefore, ſhou'd the Dr not have been the willing occaſion of the Miſtake, yet at leaſt he was very willing that it ſhou'd prevail.

Upon a view of this Story, I am apt to retract my Suſpicions about Dr *Bentley*'s Letters from Learned Profeſſors. He may perhaps have Teſtimonials of his Courteſie by him,

it

if he ſticks at no method of procuring 'em: By ſuch Arts as theſe 'tis eaſie for a Man to get a Reputation of *Humanity* abroad, without deſerving to be much commended for his Honeſty at home. 'Tis an hard word, and which I ſhould not eaſily allow my ſelf to uſe, but that I think I may take a greater Liberty in another man's behalf, than in my own.

By Dr *Bentley*'s way of treating Sir *William Temple*, Sir *Edward Sherburn*, and my ſelf, one would imagine, that he had vow'd hoſtility to all Gentlemen pretending to Letters; that he thought they broke in upon a Trade, which none but thoſe of the Body corporate of Profeſs'd Scholars ought to deal in; and ſo, looking upon 'em as the *Eaſt-India* Company does upon Interlopers, was reſolv'd to uſe 'em accordingly.

By this time, the Reader is able to judge, how far my Character of Dr *Bentley* ſuits him, and how far he might juſtly expect to have that Character publickly given him; whether his *Humanity* be *Singular*, or not, and whether my Opinion be Singular concerning it. I hope I have now ſet the *Matters of Fact* in a true light; I have only ſome few Remarks to add on ſome Paſſages in the Story which Dr *Bentley* tells of this matter, in which either his Memory or his Sincerity fail'd him.

He begins his Account with a great (and I had almoſt ſaid a wilful) Miſtake: He ſays, I have told the World in my Preface, that *I had Collated the King's MS as far as the 40th Epiſtle, and would have done ſo throughout, but*

that the Liberary Keeper, &c. Whereas I told the World, not that *I had Collated that MS*, but that *I had taken care to get it Collated*: My words are, *Collatas etiam* [viz. Epiſtolas] *curavi cum* MS° *in Bibliothecâ Regiâ*, &c.

The Difference here, as ſlight as it may ſeem, is material; and Dr *Bentley*, one may gueſs, was aware of it. He ſaw very well, that, unleſs I was repreſented as having collated the King's MS *my ſelf*, he could not well lay the Miſtakes of the Collation upon me; which he was reſolv'd however to do to the utmoſt, and therefore gave that convenient Turn to his matter of Fact at the Entrance, which might beſt ſerve to countenance his Criticiſms that follow.

With this View, he makes an unfair and broken citation of my words in the Margin; placing there only thus much out of my Preface, [*MS° in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius, pro ſingulari ſuâ humanitate, negavit*] and taking no notice of the words that introduce theſe, [*Collatas etiam curavi cum*] without which the Sentence is imperfect, and unintelligible.

Dr *Bentley* could not have given us a better Earneſt of his Integrity, at his firſt ſetting out: The reſt of his Account, we ſhall find is wrote with the ſame degree of Truth and Fairneſs. *The true Story* (ſays he) *is thus: A Bookſeller came to me in the name of the Editors, to beg* (he would ſay, *deſire*) *the uſe of the MS.* He knows very well, that Mr *Bennet* went to him in my name only; Mr *Bennet* himſelf is poſitive in the point: but leaſt the

the Dr ſhould deny it, I have, by good luck, preſerv'd ſo much of his Letter by me, as relates to this Particular. There he was pleas'd to uſe theſe Civil Expreſſions: *Mr* Bennet *deſir'd me to lend him the Manuſcript* Phalaris, *to be collated, becauſe a Young Gentleman, Mr* Boyle *of* Chriſtchurch, *was going to publiſh it. I told him, that a Gentleman of that Name and Family, to which I had ſo many Obligations, and ſhou'd always have an honour for, might command any Service that lay in my Power.* But now he ſays, that Mr *Bennet* came to him in the Name of the *Editors*. How came I to be multiply'd at this rate? unleſs he has recollected himſelf ſince, and remembers the little Circumſtances of this Tranſaction better at two or three Years diſtance, than he did immediately after it happen'd.

He proceeds in his *True Story*. — *It was not then in my Cuſtody; but as ſoon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily, and offer'd it him.* What he means by its *not being in his Cuſtody*; whether that he had lent it to ſome-body elſe, or that he was not yet fully enter'd on his Office, or that he had it not in his Pocket; muſt be a Secret, till he pleaſes to explain himſelf. Whatever his meaning be, the Reader is deſir'd to take notice, that there was about Nine Months Sollicitation us'd to procure it: A longer time than he needed to retrieve it out of the Hands of Thoſe to whom he might have lent it, or than the Ceremony of his Inauguration to his Library-keeper's Place cou'd require. I'm ſure he was much nimbler with my Col-

lator; for, inſtead of *Nine Months*, he would not allow him *Nine Days* time to peruſe it in.

His next words are, *bidding him tell the Collator not to loſe any time*, (which, tranſlated into Engliſh, is, *bidding him let the Collator know, that* he *muſt not loſe any time*) *for I was ſhortly to go out of Town for two Months.* This, I have reaſon to think, is pure Fiction; Mr *Bennet* remembers nothing of it: but he very well remembers, that when the Dr came to demand the MS of him agen, he *then* told him, he was to go into the Country, and gave that for his reaſon why he could allow him no further time to collate it in. It was a mighty Treaſure it ſeems, the Credit of the King's Library depended on the *Alexandrian* MS, and That; and therefore he would not truſt it out of thoſe Walls a day longer. Beſides, (which is a Circumſtance, that tho' Dr *Bentley* has, yet Dr *King* has not forgotten) *had it been collated, it would have been worth nothing for the future.* This was an Objection not to be got over; eſpecially ſince Mr *Bennet* had no Orders from me to take the proper way of removing it.

It follows, *'twas deliver'd, us'd, and return'd, not a word ſaid by the Bearer, nor the leaſt ſuſpicion in me, that they had not finiſh'd the Collation.* This is roundly averr'd; but the Reader has Mr *Bennet*'s, and Mr *Gibſon*'s Certificates; and, after comparing 'em with this Paſſage, may believe as he thinks fit.

Well,

Well, (ſays he) *the Collation, it ſeems, was ſent defective to* Oxon, *and the blame, I ſuppoſe, laid upon me.* Does he only *ſuppoſe* it? Did not I poſitively write him word, that it was laid upon him, and ſo laid upon him, that I was oblig'd to take notice of it? But he is to be excus'd for forgetting what I wrote to him, when it appears, that he has forgot what He himſelf wrote to me.

After a few Months, out comes the new Edition, with this Sting in the mouth of it. 'Twas a Surprize indeed to find there, that our MS was not perus'd. Our MS! that is, His Majeſty's and Mine. I thought indeed by the Price Dr *Bentley* ſet upon the MS, he fanſied himſelf to have ſome Intereſt in it: He ſpeaks out now, 'tis no longer the King's, but *Our MS*, *i. e.* Dr *Bentley*'s and the King's in common: An Expreſſion as much too familiar for a Library-keeper, as *Ego & Rex Meus* was for a Cardinal. I will not, for the future, ſo nicely obſerve his Indecencies, ſince I find he is ſo general and undiſtinguiſhing in 'em.

'Twas a Surprize indeed to find there, that our MS was not perus'd. Could they not have ask'd for it agen then after my Return? Yes, I could, Sir, and have been deny'd it again; which I was not very willing to venture. I neither thought my Self ſo Little, nor Dr *Bentley* ſo Great, nor the MS ſo conſiderable, that I ſhould make a ſecond Application for it, after ſuch a Repulſe; no, not tho' I had been ſure of obtaining it: much leſs could I ever think of asking it

agen, when, by what Mr *Bennet* had told me, I had all the reaſon in the world to think, I ſhould be agen deny'd it.

But there is a reaſon for every thing, (ſays the Dr) and *the Myſtery was ſoon reveal'd!* A pretty decent Phraſe on ſo light an occaſion; but this is not the only inſtance, where the Critick has got the better of the Divine. Well, but how was the *Myſtery reveal'd?* why, *He had the hard Hap, it ſeems, in ſome private Converſation, to ſay, that the Epiſtles were ſpurious, and unworthy of a new Edition: Hinc Illæ Lachrymæ.* If he ſaid this, as he intimates he did, at *Oxford*, where the Book was then printing, he ſaid a very uncivil thing; and what, in his Dialect, he terms his *Hard Hap*, other People would be apt to call his *Ill Breeding*. However, I ſeriouſly declare I was utterly a ſtranger to this Diſcourſe of his, till he told me of it in Print. I might hear, perhaps, of his being in *Oxford*, but I had heard too much of his Diſcourſe with Mr *Bennet*, to be curious in making any Enquiries into his private Converſation.

The Reader will excuſe this Tedious Deſcant on Dr *Bentley*'s Relation of Matter of Fact. *The true Story of our MS* was a point of importance: my Honeſty was concern'd in this part of the Diſpute, the reſt only touches my Learning. Having therefore, I hope, juſtified my Conduct where it moſt became me to do it, the Matters of pure Criticiſm will give me no Concern, I'm ſure, tho' they may put me to ſome little Trouble. I ſhall enter upon 'em with the Indifference of a Gameſter, who plays but for a trifle, which

which 'tis much the ſame to him whether he wins or loſes.

I ſhou'd now fall cloſely to my work, the Authority of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles, but that there is an Introduction of Dr *Bentley*'s that lies in my way, and muſt firſt have a Reflexion or two beſtow'd upon it.

He begins it with telling us, *that Mr* Wotton, *by the power of a long Friendſhip between 'em, engag'd him to write it.*

I hope Mr *Wotton* will let the Publick know, that he neither engag'd his Friend to write upon this Subject in this manner, nor approv'd of theſe Diſcourſes, when written: which the World will preſume him to have done, till the contrary appears; and till he has diſclaim'd Dr *Bentley*'s attempt as publickly, as he ſeems now to countenance and avow it. 'Tis a little ſtrange, that Mr *Wotton* in a ſecond Edition of his Book, which he had diſcreetly taken care to purge of moſt things that look'd like ill manners in himſelf, ſhou'd be prevail'd upon to allow a place to the ill Manners of another man. But I hear, and I am not unwilling to think, that Mr *Wotton* receiv'd this Preſent at a venture from Dr *Bentley*, and let it be printed, without giving himſelf the trouble of reading it. And I the rather fall in with this account, becauſe I find Mr *Wotton* in his Book * zealouſly vindicating the Age from the Imputation of Pedantry; and aſſuring us, that tho' the Citation of Scraps of Latin, and a nauſeous oſtentation of Reading were in faſhion Fifty or Sixty Years ago, yet that all that is now in a great meaſure diſus'd. Which, I ſuppoſe, he would ne-

* P. 415. & 416.

ver have done in ſome of the laſt Pages of his Book, if he had then known of the Diſſertation that immediately follows it.

A Gentleman of my acquaintance was obſerving to me, what a Motly, Unequal work, theſe two Pieces make, as they now lie together. Mr. *Wotton* (ſaid he) in his Reflections takes in the whole compaſs of Ancient and Modern Learning; and endeavours to ſhow wherein either of 'em has been defective, and wherein they have excell'd. A Large Deſign, fit for the Pen of my Lord *Bacon*! and in the well executing of which any one Man's Life would be uſefully ſpent! Dr *Bentley* comes after him with a Diſſertation, half as big as his Book, to prove, that three or four ſmall Pieces aſcrib'd to ſome of the Ancients, are not ſo ancient as they pretend to be: a very inconſiderable Point; and which a wiſe man would grudge the throwing away a weeks thought upon, if he could gain it! and what then ſhall we ſay of Him, that has ſpent two or three years of his life, to loſe it? Mr *W*'s motive to write was, he tells us, a piece of Publick Service that he hop'd he might do the World; Dr *Bentley*'s plainly a private Picque, and ſuch as 'twas utterly unfit for him to act upon, either as a Scholar, or a Chriſtian; much more, as he was one in Holy Orders, and that had undertaken the publick defence of Religion. Mr *W*. (continued he) is modeſt and decent; ſpeaks generally with reſpect of thoſe he differs from, and with a due diſtruſt of his own Opinions: Dr *Bentley* is Poſitive, and Pert; has

no

no regard for what other men have thought or ſaid, and no ſuſpicions that he is fallible. Mr. *W*'s Book has a Vein of Learning running through it, where there is no oſtentation of it: Dr *Bentley*'s Appendix has all the Pomp and Show of Learning, without the Reality. In truth (ſaid he) there is ſcarce any thing, as the Book now ſtands, in which that and the Appendix agree, but in commending and admiring Dr *Bentley*; in which they are ſo very much of a Piece, that one would think Dr *Bentley* had writ both the one and the other.

But leaving theſe two Friends to the Pleaſure of their mutual Civilities, I ſhall go on to the reſt of my remarks on Dr *Bentley*'s Introduction. After telling us then at whoſe Inſtance he wrote this famous Piece of Criticiſm, he begins to give us a caſt of his skill in the Point. Sir *W. Temple* had obſerv'd in favour of the Ancients, that *ſome of the Oldeſt Books we have are the beſt in their kinds.* To this Dr. *Bentley* replies, *That ſome of the Oldeſt Books are the beſt in their kinds, the ſame Perſon having the Double Glory of Invention and Perfection, is a thing obſerv'd even by ſome of the Ancients.* And for this he very learnedly quotes *Dion Chryſoſtome: But then* (ſays he) *the Authors they gave this Honour to, are* Homer *and* Archilochus, *one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other of Epode and Trochaic*, p. 7. What he means by ſaying that this had been obſerv'd *even* by ſome of the Ancients, is not eaſie to apprehend, nor why he quotes *Dion Chryſoſtome* for it, whoſe Authority either in this, or any other caſe, is

not

not very conſiderable and who beſides does not ſay that for which he's produc'd: eſpecially when there is an approved Writer more ancient than *Dion*, that has directly ſaid that for which *Dion* is improperly brought. *Dion*, in the Oration quoted, after a tedious inſipid Exordium about the different talents of praiſing and diſpraiſing, takes occaſion from thence to mention *Homer* as the famous Parent of *Panegyrick*, as *Archilochus* was of *Satyr*; and prefers 'em to all others in their way. But he has not a word there about *the Oldeſt Books being the beſt in their kind*, or *of the Double Glory of inventing and perfecting*; for which Dr *Bentley* gravely produces him. But tho' *Dion* ſays nothing of this, *Velleius Paterculus* does: *Non quenquam alium* (ſays he) *cujus operis primus Auctor fuerit, in eo perfectiſſimum reperiemus prater Homerum & Archilochum. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. 'Tis a little odd, methinks, that Dr *Bentley*, who profeſſes in this Piece of his to give Battel to Sophiſts and Sophiſtry, and to decry 'em as a company of illiterate Scribblers, ſhould yet think fit to grace the very Entrance of his Work, with vouching the Authority of as errant a Sophiſt and Declaimer as ever was; and with vouching him for what he really did not ſay; and for what had been ſaid by a much better hand, before him. But great Scholars have very particular ways with 'em.

Dr *Bentley* goes on: *But the choice of* Phalaris *and* Æſop, *as they are now extant, for the two great and inimitable Originals, is a piece of Criticiſm of a Peculiar Complexion, and muſt proceed*

ceed from a ſingularity of Palate and Judgment.

For *Æſop* it will be time enough to account, when I come to the entire Diſſertation that concerns him. But as to *Phalaris*'s *Epiſtles*, many learned men of different Ages and Countries, have been profeſs'd admirers of 'em; never any man, till the Judicious Dr *Bentley* aroſe, pretended to deſpiſe 'em: even thoſe Criticks of late days, who ſuſpected their being Genuine, yet allow'd 'em to be finiſh'd things in their way, and excellently well counterfeited. And therefore the value which Sir *W. Temple* profeſſes for 'em cannot be ſaid to proceed from a *Singularity of Palate and Judgment:* at leaſt this ought not to be ſaid by Him, who but four Pages afterwards lets us know, that *Stobæus* eſteem'd 'em ſo highly, as to inſert ſome of 'em into his Judicious Collections; and that *Suidas* terms 'em Ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασίας πάνυ, *moſt admirable Letters.* Sir *W. Temple*, one would have thought, might have been ſecured from the imputation of Singularity by the concurring Judgments of two ſuch men, for whom, we may be ſure, Dr *Bentley* on any other occaſion would have had a particular regard; the one an eminent Common-placer, and the other a no leſs eminent Dictionary-writer. 'Tis a pleaſant Reflexion to conſider, that Dr *Bentley*, at the ſame time that he is paſſing this free Cenſure on Sir *W. Temple*'s Palate, is himſelf advancing an Opinion contrary to the ſenſe of all Mankind that had ever written before him. Will not a modeſt Reader, on this occaſion,

caſion, be apt to ſay, that both the *Criticiſm* and the *Critic* too are of a *Peculiar Complexion?*

He forgets, I believe, when and where a certain Critic of our times maintain'd, that *Ovid* and *Manilius* were the only two Poets that had *wit* among the Ancients. A very extraordinary piece of Criticiſm! and which, doubtleſs, proceeded not from any *ſingularity of Palate and Judgment!* 'Tis juſt as if I ſhould ſay, that Sir *W. Temple* and Dr *Bentley* are the two beſt-bred Writers living; or, to put it into the Dr's more learned and polite way, That *Nireus* and *Therſites* were the only two *formoſe men that repair'd to the Siege of* Ilium. *Manilius* writes with juſt as much *wit* as Dr *Bentley* does with *modeſty:* only the difference is, that *Manilius*'s ſubject would not admit of *wit*; and therefore he might have it, for ought we know, tho' he did not ſhow it: whereas Dr *Bentley*'s ſubject, (which is generally *Himſelf*) does not only admit of *modeſty*, but require it.

The reſt of Dr *Bentley*'s Preamble is taken up in giving us an account how ſpurious Books came to prevail upon the World. He ſays, *This was a practice almoſt as old as Letters; but that it chiefly prevail'd, when the Kings of* Pergamus *and* Alexandria, *rivalling one another in the Magnificence and Copiouſneſs of their Libraries, gave great Rates for any Treatiſes that carried the names of Celebrated Authors*; and this he proves out of *Galen* upon *Hippocrates, de Naturâ Hominis.*

There

There are other Old Writers that tell this Story, and tell it more truly, than *Galen* did, tho' a Native of *Pergamus*. He positively affirms, in favour of the Point he is proving, that till the time of these Rival Princes, there was no such thing as a spurious Book in the World; which is neither true, nor agreeable to what Dr *Bentley* tells us in the case, that *the Practice of forging Books was almost as Old as Letters*. Here therefore, as before in the case of *Paterculus*, Dr *Bentley* should have contented himself with vouching apposite, tho' common Authorities; and not have gone out of his way to have fetch'd in a witness, that, after all, speaks against him. But he loves to surprize and dazle his Reader: for who would expect to see a point of History setl'd out of a Physician?

I thought indeed Quotation had been the Dr's peculiar Province; and that either he could manage that to advantage, or nothing. But these two awkward Proofs out of *Dion Chrysostome* and *Galen* (the very first he has produc'd) have shook my opinion of him even in this Respect. As we go further, we shall see clearlier what to judge of him.

I will detain the Reader no longer in the Approaches to our Argument, than till I have desir'd him to joyn with me in his thanks to Dr *Bentley*, for the Intimation he has given us of a certain Supplement to *Petronius* found at *Buda*. He does not, I suppose, mean that from *Alba Græca*, which any of his Dictionaries would have told him was Latin, not for *Buda*, but *Belgrade*: and therefore

fore I conclude, that this must be some new discovery, which Dr *Bentley* has had earlier notice of, than the rest of the Learned World; and that in time he will oblige us with a further account of it.

DR *Bentley* having declar'd open War against *Phalaris*, and all his Party, and having in his own Opinion gain'd the Victory, thought that the more Captive Criticks there were to follow his Chariot wheels, the more glorious would his Triumph be: He begins therefore with giving us an account of the Number and Strength of the Enemy he engages. He tells us, that the Epistles have been admitted as Genuine, ever since *Stobæus*'s time; that He has quoted 'em thrice; that *Suidas* speaks of 'em with honour; and that *Tzetzes* has made large Extracts out of 'em. *These three, I think*, says he, *are the only Men among the Ancients that make any mention of 'em* *. They are perhaps the *only Ancients*, whose testimonies are to be met with, in any of the Prefaces to *Phalaris*: but Dr *Bentley* methinks should have dug deeper for his materials, and consulted Original Authors. Had he done so, he might have found, that they are mention'd too by (*a*) *Photius* in his Epistles, that they are quoted by *Nonnus* (*b*) in his Historical Comment on St. *Gregory*'s *Invectives*, and by the (*c*) *Scholiast* on *Aristophanes*; that very

* P. 11.

(*a*) Epist. 207.

(*b*) Ὡς δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Φάλαρις ἐν ἐπιστολῇ φησι Περίλαόν τινα, &c. p. 144.

(*c*) *Plut.* vers. 142. Καὶ ὁ Φάλαρις — εἰ βούλεσθε τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καταλῦσαι πόλεμον.

Scho-

Scholiaſt, whom, one would think, the Dr, by his citing him ſo often (*e*), had throughly read. The lateſt of theſe is ſome Centuries older than either *Suidas* or *Tzetzes*. Indeed *Tzetzes*, who liv'd but in the 12th Century, deſerves not to be call'd an *Ancient*; and Dr *Bentley* himſelf is of this mind in another part of his Diſſertation (*f*), where he ſtiles him *a Later Greek*. But it was convenient that he ſhould be an Ancient here, and a Modern there, in order to the different Ends which Dr *Bentley* had to ſerve by him.

(*e*) P. 100, 117, 118, 119, 137, 140, 148, &c.

(*f*) P. 53.

Beſides theſe, there is another remarkable Quotation from the Epiſtles in *Stobæus*, which Dr *Bentley* has overlook'd; 'tis *Tit.* CCXVIII. where an entire Epiſtle of *Phalaris* is tranſcrib'd, as it is again in the Collection of *Antonius* and *Maximus* the Monks, which accompanies *Stobæus*. Had Dr *Bentley* had theſe Authorities in his view, he might with better Grounds, tho' not with more Aſſurance, have pronounc'd, that * The Epiſtles *have the general Warrant and Certificate for this laſt thouſand years, before the Reſtoration of Learning.* And thus far I can agree with him: but when he further aſſures us, that † *All the Scholars of thoſe Ages receiv'd 'em for true Originals*; as willing as I am to hear any thing in *Phalaris*'s favour, I muſt beg leave to diſſent from him; becauſe I find One of thoſe I mention'd (and Him a Scholar, I think, if there were any in the Age in which he liv'd) ſpeaking of 'em with ſome diſtruſt: 'Tis *Photius* I mean; who gives 'em indeed an extraordinary character, and prefers 'em to the

* P. 11.

† P. 11, & 12.

the Epiſtles of *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, and *Demoſthenes*: but withal intimates his Suſpicions that they are not Genuine, when he calls 'em the * *Epiſtles that are attributed to* Phalaris, and joyns 'em with thoſe that (as he ſpeaks) *are aſcrib'd to* † Brutus.

* Ep. 207. Τὰς εἰς Φάλαριν ἀναφερομένας Ἐπιστολάς.

† Ib. αἷς Βροῦτος ἐπιγράφεται.

With theſe Ancients, he tells us, many Moderns have concurr'd in Opinion; particularly, that *Fazellus* and *Jacobus Capellus*, two very Learned men, have aſſerted the credit of the Epiſtles; and that *Selden* himſelf depended on 'em ſo much, as to determine a point of Chronology out of 'em. And now what would a Modeſt man expect ſhou'd have been Dr *Bentley*'s end in reckoning up all theſe great Mens Opinions, but to ſtrengthen and countenance his Own? whereas he brings 'em in, only to ſhew how impoſſible it was for them to judge right, who had the misfortune to live before him. In ſpight of what the Learned men of ſo many Ages and Nations have thought and ſaid, Dr *Bentley* knows (*a*), and will *demonſtrate* (*b*), *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles *to be ſpurious*: Nay, *he is very much miſtaken*, he ſays, *in the nature and force of his Proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads 'em, perſiſt in his Old Opinion of making* Phalaris *an Author* (*c*). I will own to the Reader, that had theſe words offer'd themſelves to me before I had been acquainted with Dr *Bentley*'s Manner, they would have given me ſome uneaſineſs. *Phalaris* was always a Favourite-book with me; from the moment I knew it, I wiſh'd it might prove an Original: I had now and then indeed ſome ſuſpicions that 'twas not Genuine; but I lov'd him ſo much more

(*a*) P. 64.
(*b*) P. 5.
(*c*) P. 13.

more than I ſuſpected him, that I wou'd not ſuffer my ſelf to dwell long upon 'em. To be ſincere, The Opinion, or Miſtake if you will, was ſo pleaſing, that I was ſomewhat afraid of being undeceiv'd. However, I ventur'd to try, whether the Dr's Proofs would overbear me with that weight of demonſtration they threatned. I read 'em, I weigh'd 'em; and I found, to my ſatisfaction, that *Phalaris* might ſtill be an Author, notwithſtanding what Dr *Bentley* had ſaid againſt him. Nay, I aſſure the Reader, that my Doubts about the Authority of the Epiſtles, ſince I read Dr *Bentley*'s Diſſertation, are much leſſen'd; and if he ſhould write once more upon the Subject, perhaps the point would be clear to me.

His *Arguments* againſt the Epiſtles (they are to go for ſuch, till I have prov'd 'em not to be Argments) when taken out of the Confuſion with which he has deliver'd 'em, may be diſtingiſh'd into ſuch, as affect the *whole*, or touch only thoſe *Particular Epiſtles* from whence they are drawn. The firſt of theſe are of greateſt conſequence; for if any One of 'em holds, the Authority of the Epiſtles is in danger: and I ſhall therefore, with Dr *Bentley*'s leave, conſider 'em in the firſt place. In order to come at any of theſe, I muſt overlook a great many of his Pages for the preſent; not without intentions of returning to 'em: for he has advanc'd nothing on this Subject, but what ſhall, in its proper Time and Place, have a thorough Examination.

The Firſt of theſe *General Proofs*, that I meet with, (for I ſhall take 'em as they lye) is in the 12th Paragraph, where the Dr objects

againſt the *Dialect Phalaris* uſes; who reigning in *Sicily*, and being, as he tells us (*a*), born there, ſhould have ſpoken *Doric*, the prevailing Language of the *Iſland*; whereas he writes *Attic, the beloved Dialect of the Sophiſts, in which they affected to excell one another even to Pedantry and Solœciſm* (*b*).

(*a*) P. 44.

(*b*) P. 41.

Tho' it be no very material point, yet I cannot grant the Dr that the Language of theſe Letters is properly Attic. There are indeed ſeveral Attic ways of ſpeech in 'em; but ſo there are in other Authors, who confeſſedly wrote in the Common Dialect. 'Tis one thing to mix Atticiſms in one ſtyle, and another thing ſtrictly to write Attic; *Homer* did the one, *Thucydides* and *Plato* the other: however no body will ſay, that *Homer* wrote in the ſame Dialect with *Thucydides* and *Plato*. Dr *Bentley* has abundance of pure *Anglicifms* in his Latin, and *Latiniſms* in his Engliſh; but he will not for all that be willing to allow, either that his Diſſertation on *Malala* is in Engliſh, or that this on *Phalaris* is in Latin.

Well, but ſuppoſing the Letters to be in Attic, what uſe does he make of this? why, he argues from hence, that they were written by the Sophiſts; *who*, he tells us, *affected to excell one another in writing Attic, even to Pedantry and Solœciſm* (*c*) A very deep Reflection! ſo deep, that I muſt confeſs my ſelf to be a little at a loſs for the Meaning of it. The peruſal of a late Author indeed has given me a clear Notion what it is to be *affected even to Pedantry*: but the being affected *even to Solœciſm*, and in *Attic* too, is to Me, I confeſs, a very incomprehenſible degree of

(*c*) P. 41.

Af-

Affectation. I thought, the *Athenians*, of all the *Greeks*, ſpoke the moſt Properly, and Purely, and were the furtheſt remov'd from any ſuſpicion of *Solœciſm*; and that therefore no one could be guilty of it, *while* he ſpake as They ſpake, any more than a Man can ſtick ſtrictly to the Language of the Court, and yet ſpeak falſe Engliſh. But Dr *Bentley*'s Notions of Language differ much from mine; and therefore 'tis no wonder if I do not apprehend him.

To let his *Flouriſh* paſs then, and to come to his *Argument*; I will venture to ſay, that it is *a ſilly one*: and I make thus free with it, becauſe it is *my Own*, and mention'd by Me, in my Preface to *Phalaris* *, as one of the Grounds I had to ſuſpect the Authority of the Epiſtles; tho' I was far, even Then, from having that high Opinion of it Dr *Bentley* has, or thinking it to be Demonſtrative Evidence: and the more I conſider it, the leſs Weight I find in it.

* *Neq; cùm Siculis Scriptoribus placuerit ſemper Dialectus Dorica, Agrigentinorum (qui antiquitùs Dores erant) Tyrannus aliâ uti debuit.* p. 2.

For *Phalaris* was by no means oblig'd to ſpeak *Doric*, on the account of his being *a Sicilian born*; for two good Reaſons: becauſe the Natives of *Sicily* (and ſo of other places) did not always write in the prevailing Dialect of their Country; and becauſe *Phalaris* was no Native of *Sicily*. I ſhall diſpatch this Laſt point firſt, becauſe it will give us the leaſt Trouble.

If the Credit of the Letters ſtands good, *Phalaris*, we are ſure, was no *Sicilian*; Dr *Bentley* indeed ſays he was, and threatens to

† P. 44. prove it from Good Authors †: but threatn'd Hiſtory, as well as other threatn'd things, has the luck ſometimes to live long; and ſo it has happen'd in the preſent point: for the Dr, notwithſtanding his Menaces, has not, throughout his Diſſertation, ſaid a Syllable to ſhake it.

I can help the Dr indeed to One Author, that ſpeaks ſomething to his purpoſe; and Him an Old Scholiaſt too, which will pleaſe the Dr the better: *Nonnus* (*a*) ſays, that *Phalaris* was by birth a *Sicilian*; but he gives this, together with ſome other Impertinent and Ridiculous Accounts of him, which he there confutes. This is all I can at preſent do for the Dr in the matter; and as little as it is, it is more than the Dr has done for himſelf.

(*a*) In *Greg. Interl. p.* 143.

But whether *Phalaris* were of *Sicily*, or no; the Dr is poſitive (*b*), that he was not of *Aſtypalæa*, a City in *Crete*, as I have repreſented him. And upon this fanſied miſtake of mine he is very merry, and throws out a great deal of awkward Drollery; which, had there been an Occaſion given for it, would, let me tell him, have but ill become a Man of his Gravity, and a Reader of Old Scholiaſts: but as it is founded purely on a Miſtake of his own, is ſomewhat the more unſeaſonable, and unbecoming. For, after the Dr's fit of Mirth is over, I would ask him ſeriouſly, how he comes to impute the Diſcovery of this new City in *Crete* to me? do not the Epiſtles them-

(*b*) Aſtypalæa, *a City in Crete, never mention'd before by any Geographer.* Diſſert. p. 44.

Our Diligent Editors made that Diſcovery in Geography; for it could not be learnt any where elſe. Diſſert. *p.* 58.

themſelves plainly ſuppoſe it? and does not He himſelf grow wiſe enough, or ſincere enough, by the 58th Page, expreſly to own that they do ſo; and ſave me the trouble of proving it? I have the ſame Authority to ſay that *Phalaris* was born at *Aſtypalæa* in *Crete*, as that he was born at any place of that Name. And what has the Dr to oppoſe to it? why, he aſſures us that there was no ſuch City in *Crete*. Has he then a Liſt of all the *Hundred Cities* there? if he has, 'tis a compleater one by far than *Ptolomy*'s; and a mightier Diſcovery in Geography, than that of mine, with which he ſo ingeniouſly diverts himſelf. He ſhould however have had ſome Wiſdom in his Mirth, and have look'd about him, before he reſolv'd to be poſitive. Had he done ſo, he wou'd have found, that both *Goltzius* (*a*) and *Fazellus* (*b*) made this Diſcovery before me: the Laſt of theſe Dr *Bentley* has vouchſaf'd to call *a very Learned Man* (*c*); and I'll venture to call the Other ſo. So that if I did miſtake, I miſtook after Great Names: and Dr *Bently* is unpardonable, for not knowing, or not owning, what One of theſe had ſaid; for he quotes (*d*) the very Page in *Fazellus*, where the Words I have produc'd from him are. If he had read it, as well as quoted it, he could not have miſs'd 'em; They ſtand ſo fairly in the Front of *Fazellus*'s ſhort account of *Phalaris*, that they muſt needs have ſtar'd him in the Face. I will not be ſo rude as to call the Dr *a*

(*a*) Hiſt. Sicil. & Mag. Gr. ex Numiſm. *p.* 126. *Patre Cretenſis, Urbe Aſtypalide.*

(*b*) Rer. Sic. *Dec.* 1, *L.* 6, *C.* 1. *Phalaris* Cretâ Inſulâ *Urbe Aſtypalilde oreus.*

(*c*) Diſſert. *p.* 12.

(*d*) Diſſert. *p.* 12.

Second hand Critic; but the Reader may judge how far he has given me an occaſion to do it.

But no *Geographer*, he ſays, *has mention'd this City in* Crete *. He ſpeaks unwarily; I will ſuppoſe, he means, no *Old* one. No more have they ſeveral of the other *Ninety Nine*; which nevertheleſs were as ſurely there, as if half a dozen Geographers had given us the Names of them. It is enough for my purpoſe, that the Letters have mention'd this *Aſtypalæa*. If Dr *Bentley* will diſcard all Places, that occurr but once in Ancient Writers, he'll make mad Work in Geography. What does he think of *Trinacia*, the *Sicilian* Town in *Diodorus*? † what of the Κασὶς χῶρα mention'd by *Scylax*? where elſe does he meet with 'em? He'll ſay, they are corrupt Readings, perhaps: but the MSS agree in 'em. No matter for that! while the MSS are for Him, he is for Them; and no longer. And therefore to ſhorten the Work, and ſave my ſelf, and the Reader, the trouble of more Inſtances, I'll put the Dr in mind of what the Learned *Palmerius* ſays upon this paſſage in *Scylax*: *The Name of this Place, or Region,* ſays he, *occurs no where, that I know of, but here. Nevertheleſs, this is not a ſufficient reaſon why we ſhould quit the word: for how many Places, how many Regions were there, of which there is but a ſingle, or no mention made in the Authors that have come down to us?* Does the

*Diſſ. p. 44

† P. 89.

Ejus Loci ſeu Regiunculæ alibi quod ſciam non ſit mentio. Sed ideò fortè non eſt exterminanda ex hoc loco Vox. Nam quot Loca, quot Regiunculæ fuerunt quarum Authores, qui ad nos uſque devenerunt, vel ſemel, vel nunquam fecerunt mentionem?

Dr

Dr think, becauſe *Aſtypalæa* was an *Iſland* a mong the *Cyclades*, and among the *Sporades*, that therefore it could not be a *Town* any where elſe? Is not this juſt the Caſe of *Naxos*, which was an Iſle among the *Cyclades*, and yet a Town in *Crete*, and in *Sicily* too? *Strabo* mentions *Aſtypalæa* a Promontory in *Attica*, another Promontory of that name in *Caria*; a third *Aſtypalæa*, the ancient Metropolis of the Iſland *Cos*: and why might there not be an *Aſtypalæa* in *Crete* too?

I have dwelt too long on this point; however I cannot yet part with it, till I have done right to the Learned *Greek Profeſſor of Cambridge*, whom Dr *Bentley* takes upon him to correct, without the leaſt Ground or Colour of Reaſon: to ſhew, I ſuppoſe, that he was Impartial; and reſolv'd to beſtow his Good Manners, as he had done Himſelf, upon Both Univerſities.

Mr *Barnes* would have the Iſland *Aſtypalæa*, where he ſuppoſes *Phalaris* born, to be that among the *Cyclades*. Dr *Bentley*, allowing *Phalaris* to have been born in the Iſland *Aſtypalæa*, yet ſays it muſt be that among the *Sporades*; for this convincing Reaſon: *becauſe this Latter was neareſt to* Crete, *whither* Phalaris's *Wife and Son are ſuppos'd to have fled.* Ep. LXIX *. Giving the Dr Leave to ſuppoſe this *Flight* from *Aſtypalæa* to *Crete*, why muſt it needs be from the *Aſtypalæa* that was neareſt? Thoſe that fly are uſually glad to get as far as they can out of the reach of their Purſuers. But now even the Flight, upon the Suppoſition of which this fine Reaſoning turns, is it ſelf a Fiction. For neither in that

* P. 44.

Epiſtle which the Dr quotes for this, nor in any other Epiſtle, is any ſuch Flight mention'd, or ſuppos'd, or in the leaſt intimated. Was it worth his while to forge this little Piece of Hiſtory, only in order to contradict his Betters? Is the Pleaſure of inventing a Circumſtance, meerly to be rude with, an Equivalent to the ſhame of being told on't?

But he has found the Profeſſor in another Miſtake, as Material as This, and as well made out. Mr *Barnes* had call'd the Iſland *Aſtypala*, and not *Aſtypalæa*; and the Exact Dr *Bentley* therefore is ſo kind, as to inform him how it ſhould be ſpelt. A little ſhare of Good Nature would have made the Dr ſuſpect an Error of the Preſs in this caſe, if there had been any Error; and a little more Reading than he has, would have taught him, that there was no Error in it: for the Profeſſor call'd the Iſland but as *Scylax* (*a*) had call'd it before him. On both theſe accounts, the Dr might have ſpar'd his Criticiſm: and ſo he would probably, but that Mr Profeſſor had been guilty of a Fault not to be forgiven by *Gratuitouſly undertaking to Apologize for the Epiſtles of* Phalaris (*b*), in his Elaborate Edition of *Euripides*: that is, (for I can make no other ſenſe of it) by defending the Authority of the Epiſtles, *without having any thing for his Pains.* This looks as if the Dr thought Learned Men were to ſet a Price upon their Civilities, and never part with a Favour till they had their Fee.

(*a*) Ἀστυπάλαια

(*b*) Diſſer. p. 44.

But to return from our Digreſſion; Let us allow the Dr what he contends for, without any manner of Proof or Reaſon, that *Phala-*

ris

is was a *Sicilian born*: will he inferr from hence, that it was neceſſary for him to write in *Doric*? That I can never allow him. For we have Inſtances without Number, of Authors writing in a Dialect different from that of their own Country; and not a few Inſtances of *Sicilian* Writers, who laid aſide the *Doric*: and why then ſhould *Phalaris*, a Prince, and a very Arbitrary and Lawleſs one, be confin'd to it? *Agathyrſides*, the Hiſtorian of *Samos*, had he follow'd the Dialect of his Country, would have written in *Ionic*; and *Chryſermus* of *Corinth*, in *Doric*: and yet both of 'em writ in the Common Dialect, as appears by the Extracts out of 'em, preſerv'd in *Stobæus*. So did *Andronicus* the *Rhodian*, who paraphras'd ſome part of *Ariſtotle*, and *Dionyſius* the *Halicarnaſſian*; tho both *Rhodes* and *Halicarnaſs* were Cities of *Dorian* Original. *Herodotus* was of the ſame place with *Dionyſius*, and yet made the *Ionic* Dialect his choice; as *Hippocrates* of *Cos*, a *Dorian* Town alſo, had done before him. *Rhianus*, and *Epimenides* were both probably *Cretans*: that the Firſt of theſe wrote not in the particular Dialect of *Crete*, we are as ſure, as that the large Fragment aſcrib'd to him is His; that the Latter did not, we have reaſon to think from the ſhort Citation out of him in St. *Paul* (*a*), where we find the Common word ἀεὶ imploy'd inſtead of αἰὲν, which the Grammarians tell us (*b*) was peculiar to the Inhabitants of that Iſland. *Alcæus*, *Sappho*, and *Simonides*, were born in places where the *Ionic*

(*a*) Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.

(*b*) *Joh. Philop. Corinthus*, } *de Dialectis.*

Ionic was ſpoken, and yet wrote their Lyric Poems in Æolic, or Doric. Dr *Bentley* indeed pretends in ſome meaſure to account for this, by ſaying, that the *Lyric* (or, as He loves to ſpeak, the *Melic*) Poets choſe the Doric Dialect for the ſake of the Doric Harmony, which was fitted to That, and to the Nature of the Ode: but why then did not the reſt of the Lyric Writers chuſe it too? It wou'd have become *Anacreon*'s Odes, every whit as well as *Sappho*'s; and *Archilochus*'s, as well as either: and yet both *Anacreon* and *Archilochus* wrote in Ionic. So that no ſure Rule can be fix'd, or holding Reaſon given, for the Ancient Writers departing from the Idiom of their Country: Hiſtorians, Moraliſts, Philoſophers, and Poets of all ſorts practis'd it at pleaſure; chuſing ſuch a Dialect, as either pleas'd their Own Ear, or the Ears of thoſe for whoſe ſake they wrote, and whom they endeavour'd to pleaſe (*a*); or ſuch, as they thought ſuited beſt with their Subject: and very often they took up with that Dialect, which was in Faſhion among the Polite Writers of the Age in which they liv'd. For, that there was a *Faſhion* in Dialects, and that the Chief of 'em had ſeverally their Courſe and Period, in which they flouriſh'd, may (not to mention other Proofs of it) be gather'd from a Paſſage in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*; where he ſays of the Old *Greek* Authors, that *they choſe*

(*a*) This probably was the Caſe of *Callimachus*, in his Hymn upon the Baths of *Pallas*, compos'd by him in Doric, to compliment the *Argians* (or *Argivans*, as Dr *Bentley* new names 'em, *p.* 82): tho the ſame reaſon will not hold for his Other Doric Hymn, dedicated to the honour of *Ceres*: nor can any reaſon I believe, be given for it, but what will equally prove, that he ought to have written the reſt of his Hymns in Doric.

hose the Ionic Dialect to write in, as being hat which was most in Vogue n their time (*b*). I suppose his only as *probable*, Dr *Bentley* would have said it was *demonstrable*. But no man should be Dogmatical in Cases of this Nature, where several other Circumstances, besides the vast distance of Time, concur to make the Subject obscure; where all is but a Lucky Guess, and He that is most Learned must, if he be fair, confess that he has but a very dim and uncertain Light to see by.

(*b*) Ὅιτε τὴν Ἰάδα προελόμενοι Διάλεκτον, τὴν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις μάλιστα ἀνθοῦσαν. *Dion. Hal. in Thucyd.*

It will then be very hard upon our *Sicilian* Prince, to deny him a Liberty, which Writers of all sorts, and of all other Countries and Times have taken: and it will be harder still, if we consider, that this is what has been done often, even by *Sicilians* themselves. *Diodorus* and *Empedocles* are famous Instances of this kind; the One in Prose, and the Other in Verse: *Archimedes* the *Syracusian*'s Works do not all equally partake of the Doric Idiom; some have more, and some have less of it, as they were written sooner or later; and his Treatise of *the Sphære and Cylinder*, the most remarkable part of his Works, least of all.

To come yet closer to our point: We have a Letter writ by *Dion* of *Syracuse* to *Dionysius* Tyrant of that place, and part of another † written by *Dionyus* himself; both preserv'd among the Epistles of *Plato*; where there is not the least shadow of Doricism: but as well the Prince, as the Philosopher, have *written their Epistles in such a Dialect, as if* (to use Dr *Bentley*'s Gentleman-like Phrase) *they had gone to School at* Athens *.

† *Plat.* Epist. 7. *Dionis Cognatis.*

* Disser. p. 43.

Nay

Nay ſome of the Princes and States of Sicily, and other Dorian Countries, have caus'd *Coins* to be ſtruck, whoſe Inſcriptions are not in pure Doric. Abundance of Inſtances of this kind are to be met with in *Goltzius*, *Paruta* and *Harduin*: I ſhall give the Reader a Taſte of them in the Margin *.

* Διονυσίου βασιλέως· Ἱερωνύμου βασιλέως. Ξυσάρχης ἱερὸν ἀγῶνος, a *Cretan* mony; in ſome other Inſcriptions it is Ξυσάρχας. Τέλη, the Inſcription of a Coin, belonging to *Velia*, a Town in *Magna Græcia*.

But the moſt remarkable Inſtance of all is that of *Zaleucus*, King of the *Locrians*, a Doric Colony; the Preface to whoſe Laws is preſerv'd in *Stobæus*, an exact and faithful Copier of Old Authors, and has plainly nothing of the Doric Dialect in it. *Diodorus Siculus*, who does not ſo ſtrictly tranſcribe, but chuſes rather to weave things into the Phraſe and Body of his Hiſtory, has the ſame Preface, with ſome Alterations; but none, that make it more Doric than it is in *Stobæus*.

And now, upon a View of theſe Inſtances, (and others of this kind, which I could produce; but I ſpare the Reader) I might beſpeak the Dr in his own pert way of Enquiry; *Pray, how came Attic* (or any other Dialect but the Doric) *to be the Court Language at* Syracuſe? *How came* Zaleucus, *and* Dionyſius *the Tyrant, ſo to doat on the Dialect of a Democraty* (a)? How is it, that thoſe Little Princes of *Sicily*, as Arbitrary and Jealous of their Prerogative as the Mightieſt Monarch whatever, allow'd of Inſcriptions on their Coins, which were not in the Language of their Country?

(a) Diſſ. p. 41.

Country? Any clear Solution that he shall please to afford us of these matters will equally serve to give us an account, why *Phalaris* too might be excus'd from writing in Doric.

The Dr indeed has endeavour'd to prevent me in some part of the Evidence that I have brought; and has excepted against such Instances as those of *Empedocles*, and *Diodorus*, *whose Case* he says, *is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former being to write an* EPIC POEM, *shew'd an excellent Judgment in laying aside his Country Dialect for that of the* Ionians; *for the Doric Idiom had not Grace and Majesty enough for the Subject he was engag'd in: being proper indeed for Mimes, Comedies, and Pastorals, where Men of Ordinary Rank are represented,* &c. *but not to be us'd in* HEROIC, *without great disadvantage* (*a*). (*a*) Differ. p. 49.

I desire Dr *Bentley* to inform me, in what Old Scholiast, or Manuscript Author, he has met with this Curious account of *Empedocles*'s writing an *Epic Poem*: as much out of the way as he loves to read, he'll be hard put to't, I believe, to find an Authority for it. If he can, 'tis plain he knows more of *Empedocles*'s Works than *Laertius* did; who has been so absurd, as to inform us particularly of several less considerable Pieces of his, and to pass over altogether in silence this *Epic Poem*. Dr *Bentley* will be pleas'd, at his leisure, to produce his Vouchers in this point; which I am apt to believe he will do, at the same time that he lets us know where the *Buda MS of Petronius* is to be met with. *Empedocles* wrote many things in Hexameters indeed; but Dr

Bentley

Bentley ſure cannot be ſo wretchedly ignorant as to think, that every large Copy of Verſes written in Hexameters, is an *Epic Poem*. *Ariſtotle* would have inform'd him, that *Empedocles* was ſo far from being an *Epic Poet*, or Poet of the firſt Rank, that he ſcarce deſerv'd the Name of a Poet at large: *There is nothing*, ſays he, *that* Homer *and* Empedocles *agree in but their Verſe*; *and therefore* Homer *indeed may juſtly be call'd a Poet, but* Empedocles *rather a Naturaliſt than a Poet* *. Or if *Ariſtotle* be too good a Book for Dr *Bentley* to converſe with, there is a Writer of leſs ſize even his Friend Mr *Wotton*, who would have taught him the Diſtinction between *Philoſophical* and *Epical Poems*; that is, ſuch as *Empedocles* and *Lucretius* wrote on the one ſide and *Homer* and *Virgil* on the other. He who is ſo nicely ſevere upon *Phalaris*, for confounding μίλος and ἔλεγεῖον (*b*), ſhould have taken care not to have given *Phalaris*'s Friends an Opportunity of making Reprisals. The Fatal Miſtake in this caſe was that *Suidas*, the Dr's Oracle, calls him ἐποποιὸν, which ſtrictly taken, ſignifies an *Epic Poet*, but in it's looſe ſenſe a *Verſifier* only; and the Dr was not at leiſure to take notice of this diſtinction.

* Οὐδὲν κοινὸν ἔχειν Ὁμήρῳ ἢ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ πλὴν τὸ μέτρον, διὸ τὸν μὲν Ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ Φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ Ποιητήν. Poet. c. 1.

Comp. of anc. and mod. Lear. p. 32.

(*b*) Differ. p. 59.

And if *Empedocles* did not write an *Epic Poem*, how did he *ſhew his Judgment in laying aſide his Country Dialect*? Could not *Phyſics* have been as *Judiciouſly* wrote in Doric *Verſe*, by *Him*, as in Doric *Proſe* by *Ocellus Lucanus*, and the reſt of the *Pythagoreans*? His Treatiſe

tiſe of *Expiations* (c), why would it not have born being written in Doric, as well as *Theocritus*'s *Pharmaceutria?* eſpecially ſince *Laertius* intimates, that the Subject of that Treatiſe was in great meaſure drawn from the *Pythagoreans*: would it not properly then have been compos'd in the Dialect thoſe Philoſophers us'd? We have ſeveral ſmall Remains of *Empedocles*; but not a Line of his in Doric. We have a Large Fragment of his directed to the People of *Agrigent*, his Townſmen: did he *ſhew his Judgment in laying aſide his Country Dialect* there too, when he was directing his Verſes to the very People of his Country? Had *the Doric Idiom not Grace and Majeſty enough for the Subject he was engag'd in*, when the Subject was no higher than an Account of Himſelf to his own Countrymen? If Doric be *proper for Mimes, Comedies, and Paſtorals, where Men of ordinary Rank are repreſented*, why is it not as proper for little Poems, where Men of ordinary Rank are addreſs'd to? I believe it would puzzle a Man of leſs Sagacity than Dr *Bentley*, to tell us, for what reaſon *Empedocles* us'd Ionic, but becauſe he had a mind to't; and may not the ſame reaſon be urg'd alſo in behalf of the Attic of *Phalaris*?

(c) Καθαρμοί.

Dr *Bentley* has had very ill Luck in bringing off the *Poet*, let us ſee whether he has better in what he has to ſay for the *Hiſtorian*. * *Diodorus Siculus*, he tells us, *and the other Hiſtorians of Dorian Nations, had great reaſon to decline the Uſe of their Vernacular Tongue, as improper for Hiſtory; which beſides the affectation of Eloquence, aims at Eaſineſs and Perſpicuity, and is*

* P. 50.

is deſign'd for General Uſe: but the Doric is Coarſe and Ruſtic, and always clouded with an Obſcurity. The Reader cannot but obſerve in this Paſſage the particular Beauty and Happineſs of the Dr's Expreſſion: but it matters not much how he Writes, let us conſider how he Reaſons.

If the Dr's Solution be juſt, how came *Archimedes*, and the *Pythagorean Naturaliſts*, and *Moraliſts*, not to *decline the uſe of their Vernacular Tongue*, as well as the *Hiſtorians*? They all, I dare ſay, aim'd as much at *Perſpicuity*; and the Laſt of the Three, doubtleſs, deſign'd their Treatiſes as much for *General Uſe*. I will not ſay indeed, that they *affected Eloquence*; becauſe I do not think that a good Character, whatever Dr *Bentley* may: but, which is much better, they *were* Eloquent, very Lofty and Magnificent, and withal very Clear in their Expreſſion: on both which accounts they are recommended by *Dionyſius Halicarraſſeus* *, to be read by all thoſe that deſire to write well. And his Judgment in this Caſe is the more to be valu'd; becauſe He wrote excellently well himſelf, and with great Perſpicuity.

* Μεγαλοπρεπὴς δὲ τῇ λέξει, καὶ πυκνὸς· καὶ ἐδὲν περιλείπων σαφηνείας. T. 2, p. 70.

'Tis true, as the Doric Dialect grew out of Uſe and Requeſt, their Writings grew leſs Eaſie and Perſpicuous; and *Porphyry* had reaſon therefore to attribute the decay of the *Pythagorean* Sect to the Uſe, or rather to the Decay of that Dialect: but without diſpute the Doric, in its flouriſhing days, had the ſame degree of Clearneſs as the reſt; and the Phi-

Philoſophers, that writ in it, deſign'd their Works to be of as General Uſe, and to laſt as long as thoſe of the Hiſtorians. So that Dr *Bentley* has aſſign'd no Reaſons for the Hiſtorians not writing in Doric, but what will ſerve as well to prove Others not to have writ in it, tho' we are ſure they did: a Way of arguing, worthy his Adventurous Pen! and which nobody, I believe, will envy him the honour of!

Hitherto I have been proving againſt Dr *Bentley*, (I hope not without ſucceſs) that *Phalaris* was under no obligation of writing Doric, tho' he had been *a Sicilian born*: much leſs was he oblig'd to write it, upon the account of his Living among the *Agrigentines*, or Reigning over them, as Dr *Bentley* pretends. *He was a Publican* (ſays the Dr) *or Collector of Taxes; could not that Perpetual* Negoce *and Converſe with the Dorians bring his Mouth to ſpeak a little broader**? No doubt it *could*; and perhaps it *did*: but the Queſtion is, whether, notwithſtanding his learning Doric, he might not retain another Dialect with it; and ſpeak it, and write it at his pleaſure? But *would not He that aim'd at Monarchy, and for that reaſon deſign'd to be Popular, have quitted his Old Dialect for that of the place, and not by every word he ſpake make the Invidious Diſcovery of his being a Stranger?* The Dr forgets, that every one of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles were written *after* he was a Tyrant: He might, for ought we know, ſpeak Doric before he got into Power; but afterwards there was no need of courting the People, for he govern'd by *his Blew-coats*†. And I think he could not have taken a more proper way of ſhewing his Tyrannical Temper, than by

* P. 46.

† P. 39.

throwing off the Language of the Country, and uſing a Foreign Dialect in all his Diſpatches. *The Conqueror* is ſuppos'd to have done much the ſame thing by Us, when he chang'd the Language of our Law; and he ſhew'd himſelf in nothing more a Conqueror, than by doing it.

But the Dr has urg'd, that *Phalaris*, being ſuch a Tyrant, would not probably have been *fond of the Language of a Democraty, that was eminently μισοτύραννος, an hater of Tyrants* *. Was not Doric too the Language of the *Lacedemonians?* and did not they hate Tyrants, as much as the *Athenians* themſelves? At this rate, *Phalaris* could not have ſpoken any Dialect of the Greek Tongue, for every one of 'em was the Language of a Democraty, ſomewhere or other. If the Dr's Reaſoning be right indeed, it may happen to prove that the Epiſtles are not Genuine, becauſe not written in *Perſic*; but it will never prove 'em Spurious, becauſe they are not written in Doric. After all, what Trifles are theſe to amuſe us with? that *Phalaris*, to be ſure, would not ſpeak Attic, becauſe *the* Athenians *in his time drove out* Piſiſtratus? Would I give my ſelf leave to Declaim at this rate, might I not with much better colour ſay, that *Phalaris* would, to chuſe, make uſe of that Dialect; becauſe it was the Language of *Piſiſtratus*, his Brother Tyrant? I ſee Dr *Bentley* loves no leſs to argue, than read out of the way; and it is ſo much out of the way, that I am aſham'd to follow him.

* P. 41.

Were I ſo very a Critic, as to love Wrangling rather than Truth, I might further diſpute it with the Dr, whether Doric were the

the Language of *Agrigent*, or no, and that upon no less an Authority than *Strabo*'s, who expresly says, that *Agrigent* was a Colony of the *Ionians* (*a*): And Monsieur *Menage* (*b*) rely'd upon this so far, as to account from hence for the Ionic of *Empedocles*. However, I must freely own my Opinion, that this Passage is corrupted, and that we ought to read Γελώων instead of Ἰώνων, according to the account which that most Exact and Faithful Writer *Thucydides* has given us; not to mention *Polybius*, and the *Scholiast* on *Pindar*. And this Conjecture is the more probable, because *Strabo* seems to be speaking there of Colonies drawn from one part of *Sicily* to another; such as that from *Syracuse* to *Camarina*, which he mentions in the words immediately foregoing. I wonder how this escap'd the most Learned and Acute *Casaubon*'s observation. Not to insist upon this therefore; but allowing Dr *Bentley*, that *Agrigent* was a *Dorian* Town, as I believe it was; allowing him, that *Phalaris* was even born there, if he pleases, or in any other Town in *Sicily* that he shall pitch upon, as I believe he was not: and allowing further, that *Phalaris* was oblig'd on this account to speak Doric as long as he liv'd, yet still I have One Question to ask the Dr; How can he prove, that *Phalaris* did not write Doric? tis true, the Epistles at present are not in that Dialect: but they might have been Originally in it;

(*a*) Καμαρίνα ἄποικος Συρακουσίων, Ἀκράγας δὲ Ἰώνων. L. 6, p. 272.

(*b*) *Certè ut erat Agrigentum Ionum Colonia, teste Strabone, Agrigentini, licet Siculi, (qui quidem Siculi Dores erant) Ionico sermone forsan utebantur.* Notæ in Diog. Laert. l. 8, sect. 60.

and afterwards upon the diſuſe of that Dialect, *have been turn'd out of it into the Ordinary Language, at the Fancy of ſome Copyer before the Days of* Stobæus *. This the Dr has irrefragably prov'd, in the very Article we are upon, to have been the caſe of *Ocellus Lucanus*'s Book, περὶ τῆς τῦ Παντὸς φύσιος: and why may it not have been the caſe too of *Phalaris*'s Epiſtles? If ſome Copyer, *ſince Stobæus's time*, thought that *Ocellus*'s *Phyſics* would look better out of Doric, than in it, and therefore tranſdialected 'em; why might not ſome other Copyer, *before Stobæus's time*, think the ſame of our Tyrant's Letters, and do the ſame to 'em? and why, after this was done, might not the Original *Phalaris* be loſt, as well as the Original *Ocellus*? It is certain, *Stobæus* thought that this might ſo happen, or at leaſt, that *Phalaris* might not have written Doric originally; for he tranſcribes ſeveral of his Epiſtles into his Excellent Work, in the very Language we now find 'em, without imagining in the leaſt that they could not be Genuine, becauſe they were not in Doric. Such a Conſequence as that never enter'd into his Head: He had met with ſeveral *Sicilian* Writers, that choſe to write out of the Dialect of their Country; particularly *Empedocles*, an Author of the ſame Town with *Phalaris*: (He had not indeed met with any *Heroic Poem* of his; that Lucky Hit was reſerv'd for the Inquiſitive Dr *Bentley*) and he had met alſo with ſome Writers, whoſe works were at firſt in all probability penn'd in Doric, and yet were in another Dialect in his time: for inſtance, the Pieces of *Perictyone*, and

* P. 49.

Ari-

Ariſtoxenus, two *Pythagoreans*; and who very probably wrote Doric, becauſe they were *Pythagoreans*; and yet in *Stobæus*'s time it is plain, that ſome part of the Writings of the One were in Ionic, and thoſe of the Other (if I remember right; for I have not *Stobæus* now by me) in the Common Dialect. Let Dr *Bentley* then take which ſide he pleaſes; either that *Perictyone*, and *Ariſtoxenus*, (and I will add *Zaleucus* too, who we are ſure was a *Pythagorean* alſo from very good Authority *) either, I ſay, that theſe *did* write originally in Doric, or that they *did not*. If they did, then we have Inſtances in 'em of Ancient Authors tranſdialected very early, long before the days of *Stobæus*; if they did not, then here is a plain Proof that Authors (all probably) of Doric Countries (to be ſure Two of 'em were) might nevertheleſs not write Doric: and either of theſe being granted me, the Reader ſees, there will be no difficulty in juſtifying the Dialect of *Phalaris*. Indeed if the Laſt be granted me, it will be pretty difficult to juſtifie Dr *Bentley*'s hardy aſſertion, that *the* Pythagoreans *would ſooner have loſt their Lives, than have written out of Doric* (*a*); and that, if they had done it, *it is moſt certain they would have been baniſh'd the Society* (*b*). And therefore Dr *Bentley*, I ſuppoſe, to make himſelf Conſiſtent, (a very hard Task!) will chooſe rather to grant, that theſe Writers were originally in Doric: and if they were, he will pleaſe to conſider, how they got out of it; and ſhew us, why *Phalaris* might not get out the very ſame way.

* *Porph.* in Vitâ *Pyth. p.* 15. *Diod. Sic. l.* 12, *p.* 84.

(*a*) Diſſer. P. 47.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 48.

And here I should take my leave of this tedious Article, but that I hear Dr *Bentley* crying out Ἔυρηκα, and calling loudly on the Learned World to listen to a mighty *Discovery*. He undertakes to prove, that Ocellus Lucanus *did not repudiate his Vernacular Idiom, nor compose his Book* [στὸ τῆς τοῦ Παντὸς φύσεως] *in the Dress that it now wears, but in his own Country fashion* *; that is, in plain English, that he did not write it in the Common Dialect, as 'tis now extant, but in Doric. Upon this the Dr spreads his Plumes, and swells beyond his usual pitch: *I dare engage to make out*, and, *If I may expect Thanks for the Discovery*, are Expressions that carry in 'em an Extraordinary Air of Satisfaction; and seem a little too Pompous for the Matter they introduce, were it entirely New, and his Own; but they much less become it, considering it is all taken, Word for Word, out of a Preface to an Edition of *Ocellus*, as I shall now shew the Reader.

* Dissert. p. 47.

Vizzanius, above fifty Years ago, put out *Ocellus* †; and in his *Prolegomena* to that Piece has said every thing that Dr *Bentley* has produc'd on this Subject, to a Tittle; and (which is a little unlucky) has said it almost in the very same Words too: only Dr *Bentley* is in English (I compliment him when I say so) and *Vizzanius* is in Latin. The Dr has condescended to translate that Honest Editor's Preface, without making the least Improvement of a single Argument there, but not without worsting several; and has the Modesty after that to take it all to Himself, as the Inventor; and to talk higher of this

† *Bononiæ* 1646.

this *Petty Larciny* of his, than *Vizzanius* did of the Original Discovery; which he thought too Obvious to value himself upon. Perhaps Some, who have not the Opportunity of comparing this Editor with Dr *Bentley*, may be glad to have a Particular Account of the Dr's Ingenuity in the matter: and therefore I shall take the trouble of going through all he says on this point, and plainly shew, whence he had his Intelligence.

I find (says the Dr *) *it was agreed and covenanted among the Scholars of that Italian Sect,* φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ (Jambl. Vit. Pyth.) I can tell him, where he *found* it, it was in *Vizzanius*: who says the same thing, and quotes the very same Authority for it. *Id certè asserendum crediderim Ocellum Doricâ Dialecto suum Opus conscripsisse, tùm quia Pythagoræos quoslibet illi studuisse comperio, tùm quia id Pythagoræ suadeant Instituta, qui semper Idiomatum Græcorum Doricum maximè voluit sectari, tùm antiquius, tùm etiam præstantius illud arbitratus teste Jamblicho, in Vitâ Pythag.* Indeed he makes no such Inference as Dr *Bentley* does, *that the* Pythagoreans *would sooner have lost their Lives, than have broken this Agreement; and that 'tis most certain, if any body had publish'd a Book against that Injunction, he would have been banish'd the Society*: because he knew, this was not observ'd by *Empedocles*, nor by the Author of the χρυσᾶ ἔπη, nor even by *Jamblichus*, while he is writing this Account of the *Pythagoreans*; no, nor by *Pythagoras* himself, if *Diogenes Laertius* may be credited.

* Dissert. p. 47.

'Tis true, *Vizzanius* speaks a little unwarily; and may be understood to intimate, that the Use of this Dialect among the Italian Sect was from the institution of *Pythagoras* himself; a Mistake, which, if he were in, he was probably led into by too slight a perusal of *Jamblichus*. Dr *Bentley* took all he found there for his *Own*, and this Mistake among the rest; and when he had it, to make it look the more like his Own, gave it the Confident Turn. Immediately these *Institutes of Pythagoras* grew a solemn *Injunction of Pythagoras* *, which the Dr talks as familiarly of, as if he had seen a Copy of it. But methinks he might have inferr'd, that there was no Injunction of this kind, from what he himself had told us out of *Jamblichus* but Three Lines before; that this Use of the Dialect proceeded from a *Covenant and agreement among the Scholars* † themselves: For they who know what an Implicit Regard was paid to *Pythagoras*'s *Orders* by all his Scholars, will eatily agree, that there could be no need of their entring into a Compact, to do any thing that He had commanded. Dr *Bentley*'s Adversaries may be as severe upon him, on the account of his Criticisms as they please: but they needs must allow him to have a Particular Talent at Reasoning; and to have thus much at least of a Good Disputant, that he is sure to *make the most* of his Argument.

* P. 47.

† P. 47.

Dr *Bentley*'s next Suggestion is this; *We are assur'd that the other Pieces of this Author were made in Doric, as one of Law,* περὶ Νόμου, *cited by* Stobæus. *Vizzanius* too cites this Fragment of *Ocellus*'s Piece περὶ Νόμου, from *Stobæus*; and

and makes the same Use of it: Ocellum *scil.* Lucanum *scimus Librum de Legibus scripsisse — hujus fragmentum exhibet Stobæus — Dorica Dialecto expressum*, &c.

Dr *Bentley* goes on; *But, which is plain Demonstration, Four Citations are brought by the same Writer out of this very Book,* περὶ τῆς τῶ παντὸς φύσιος; *all which are in Doric, and not, as they are now extant, in the Common Dialect.* *Vizzanius* referrs us to these four very places as they lye in *Stobæus*, and observes too that they are there in Doric: not, as they are now extant, in the Common Dialect. *De cæteris tandem in hoc* Ocelli *Opusculo contentis quis dubitet? Si enim primum respiciamus Caput, textum ejusdem ultimum; si secundum caput, textum sextum; si tertium caput, postremam textûs quarti partem; & textum quintum & sextum; iisdem servatis vocibus, immutatâ licet Dialecto, ad amussim velut* Ocelli *dogmata describit* Stobæus.

From hence Dr *Bentley* argues, that *this Tract of* Ocellus *now extant is to be acknowledg'd for a Genuine Work; which HITHERTO Learned Men have doubted of from this very busines of the Dialect.* So does *Vizzanius*, in the passage before quoted; and agen, *Grave* Stobæi *Testimonium, non perfunctorie, sed summo studio veteris monumenta sapientiæ semper lustrantis illud* [*Opus de Lege*] *ab* Ocello *prodisse dubitare non sinit; & tamen Dorico Idiomate videmus conscriptum, cujus nec minima in hoc* [περὶ τῆς τῶ παντὸς φύσιος] *opere conspiciuntur vestigia: ideòq; an verò* Ocellus *aureum hoc opus conscripserit, jure quemcunque suspicari contingat — hinc tamen certa potius quibus illi operi fides conciliatur, erumpunt argumenta.* The only difference between *Vizzanius*

zanius and Dr *Bentley* upon this point, that *Vizzanius* does not triumph over the miſtakes of thoſe that went before him; not tell us that All the Learned Men of Latter Ages had doubted whether the Work were Genuine, even when he might perhaps have ſaid this ſafely, and truly: whereas Dr *Bentley* ſays it, fifty Years afterwards; and aſſures the World, that *HITHERTO Learned Men have doubted* of this matter, at the very time that he is Tranſlating a learned Man, who was ſo far from doubting of it, that he was giving Reaſons, why No-body ſhould ever doubt of it hereafter.

Dr *Bentley* concludes his Whole Argument thus; *Now We ſee by theſe Fragments, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preſerv'd; the Doric only being chang'd into the ordinary Language, at the Fancy of ſome Copyer, ſince the Days of* Stobæus. *Vizzanius* does not ſpeak quite ſo ſtrongly as the Dr; but he gives much the ſame account of it: *Quis dubitet de hoc Opuſculo, cum viderit eoſdem quos recudit* Stobæus *textus iiſdem quidem omnino verbis, ac diverſâ Dialecto, Doricâ ſcilicet conſcriptos? ... facili immutatione* Ocelli *Operis ad Atticam traducta Dialectum?* and in the Words before quoted [*Hinc cerea prius*, &c.] He anſwers the Cavils of thoſe who ſuſpected *Ocellus* from his Dialect, and handſomly turns their own Arguments againſt them. But I muſt give Dr *Bentley* his Due, and own he has here made ſome Improvement: for *Vizzanius* never thought of carrying this Argument ſo far as to prove, that becauſe theſe few Fragments cited by *Stobæus* exactly agree with

Ocel-

Ocellus, as we now have him; therefore 'tis *certain, that every Word of the True Book is faithfully preserv'd.* This was a Consequence reserv'd for Dr *Bentley*, which a Common Critic, who reasons but like other men, would never have thought of: and it being the only one which he has produc'd of his Own on this Occasion, I should not be just to him, unless I fairly told the World, that he *did not borrow it.*

And now, why don't the Critics, Great and Small, rise up to do him Homage? How many *Letters can he produce from Learned Men abroad*, who have paid him their acknowledgments for this Information? What has he to say for himself? can he pretend not to have seen this Edition of *Ocellus?* how came he then to hit just upon all *Vizzanius* says, and no more? has he not seen the *Amsterdam Edition* of Dr *Gale* neither? To what purpose does he think that Dr *Gale* set those Four Passages out of *Stobæus* before his Edition, but to let People see that his Author was Genuine, and writ in Doric? He did not indeed make a Stir with that matter in his Preface, because he knew that *Vizzanius* had exhausted the point before Him; and he thought it not fit for Him to take the humble and dishonourable Task of transcribing another Man's Labours, either with, or without naming him.

I am glad of this Opportunity of mentioning the Worthy *Dean of York*, and of paying my Publick Acknowledgments to him, for the particular Kindness and Favours I receiv'd from him, while I was under his Care. The

Foun-

Foundation of all the little Knowledge I have in these matters was laid by Him; which I gratefully own: for I think my self oblig'd to let the World know, whom I have been beholden to; tho' Dr *Bentley*, I find, be of another Opinion.

And now I think I may without Vanity say that I have outdone Dr *Bentley* in the way of *Discovery*: for Mine, as inconsiderable as it is, is a Discovery; and such an one, as proves His to be None.

FROM the particular *Idiom* of Speech which *Phalaris* us'd, Dr *Bentley* has *proved* nothing but this, that he can Construe a Latin Preface, take a Learned Man's Notions, and calmly put 'em off for his own; and then imperiously summon in the Men of Letters to do Obeysance to Him, as the Discoverer: all which I, and his Readers would readily have allow'd him, without putting him to the trouble of proving it. Having therefore thus strenuously manag'd the Argument of *the Dialect*, he now turns his Formidable Pen to another kind of Proof: He has found out, that the *Greek* even of that Dialect is more *Modern* than the Times of *Phalaris*.

His Arguments on this Head are so far from making any thing to his purpose, that one would imagine he brought 'em only as so many Instances to illustrate what he said in the 13th Page, that Men *have been deceiv'd in their Conjectures of this nature, even to Ridicule*. For, could he make out what he aims at, and produce some Expressions from these

Epi-

Epiſtles, that are not us'd by the Ancient Greek Writers, what would he inferr from hence? that theſe Words were certainly coin'd ſince the Age of *Phalaris*? how does he know but that they might be Then in uſe, and dropp'd afterwards when the Learned Age came on; and reviv'd again, as that declin'd? *Horace* thought ſuch Changes and Revolutions in Speech not unuſual: and it might eaſily be prov'd, that there have been many ſuch, both in the Greek and Latin Tongue; but that Dr *Bentley* has made the Proof of it ſuperfluous here: for he has not produc'd any One Word, that is of that New Stamp he pretends. And among all the *Marks and Moles* (*a*) which, he ſays, *betray the Epiſtles to be a Thouſand Years younger than* Phalaris (*b*), he has had the Judgment to chuſe out ſuch, as betray Him to be as little a Critic in the Greek Language, as he is in his Own.

(*a*) Differ. *P.* 52.
(*b*) P. 51.

He has ſo propos'd his Firſt Inſtance, that He and I ſhall have no Diſpute about it in This Place: κατηγορεῖν, in the ſenſe of *accuſing*, is, he ſays, *an Innovation in Language, for which the Ancients us'd* κατηγορῶ. I entirely agree with him, 'tis an Innovation in Language, and a very Modern one; ſo Modern, that I ſuſpect 'twas firſt broach'd by *a Little Greek*, that writ towards the latter end of the 17th Century: (whom I ſhall not forget to talk with on this ſcore, when I find his Criticiſm in its Proper Place, among the *Faults of the Verſion*) and conſequently I apprehend the Epiſtles to be in no danger from This Word; but the next ſeems to carry Terror in it. For the Dr declares,

clares, that προδιδόναι, which in the XVI *Epist.* must signifie, *having given before*, w *never so us'd by the Ancients, but always for ving betray'd.* And this is one of the Insta ces that is to bring down the Date of t Letters a *Thousand Years* lower than their pr tended Author. Let it have its force, to t Confusion of *Phalaris*, and all his Adherent but what shall we do for St *Paul?* He com far within this Period; so that the Writin that carry his Name must be Four hundr Years Younger than We Christians suppo 'em: and the Epistle to the *Romans* could n be the Genuine Work of that *Apostle*, but w penn'd (as *Phalaris*'s Epistles were) by so *more Recent Sophist*, whom Dr *Bentley* h *detected and unmask'd* by the word προδίδωμι employ'd to signifie, *he gave before*; [*Ro* xi. 35.] but *never* us'd in this sense, till man Ages after our Saviour. What shall we s to this? Shall we allow Dr *Bentley* to be Scurvy Critic, or shall we in Tenderness t his Honour, give up our Bibles? Perhap the Dr may, for this once, be mistaken and I'm the rather inclin'd to think he s because I find προδίδωμι and προδοσις us'd in th very same sense by the Best Writers of Anti-

(a) Καὶ τὸν quity: *Xenophon* (*a*), *Demosthenes* (*b*), and *Ari-* πρὸς Ο- *stotle* (*c*); if the *Oeconomicks* be his.
φειλόμενον
(in margine rectius προοφειλόμενον) ἀπέδωκε, κἂν μικρὸς προέδωκεν ὥστε τὸ πρᾶγμα πολὺ προθυμότερον εἶη. Which *Leunclavius* rightly translates, *Præterea* Cyrus & *Stipendium* prius *illis debitum persolvit, & menstruum aliud* ante tempus numeravit. *Xen. Hellen.* l. 1, p. 441.

(b) — μισθοφόρους πάντας, ὡς οὔτε τὴν ἀρίστην, δωρεὰς & προδόσεις δοὺς ἐκείνῳ μεγάλας. Orat. πρὸς Πολυκλ.

(c) — ἐπεὶ περὶ παντὸς ἦν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτὸν εὐπορίαν, ὥστε καὶ προδεδομένου τριήμισυ στιπτικίαν δωρεὰν αὐτοῖς δοῦναι. Oecon. l. 2.

These

These are Great Authorities; but if they should prevail with the Dr to withdraw this Argument, we are not yet safe; he has still a stronger Objection against the Epistles of St *Paul*, and *Phalaris*, taken from the word διώκω, put for *following*; which, he says, *anciently signified to pursue, when that which fled fear'd and shunn'd the Pursuer.* What pity 'tis, the Knowing Dr *Hody* had not learnt this Secret Piece of Criticism sooner? how easily might he have prov'd the Septuagint of a much less Authority, and Later Date than *Vossius* contended for, by that Expression in *Ezra* (ix. 4.) πᾶς ὁ διώκων λόγον Θεοῦ ?" by which however the LXX, I suppose, were far from meaning, *Every one that persecutes the Word of God.* Διώκω, as I remember, is us'd once only by *Phalaris* in this sense; but I'm sure 'tis frequently so employ'd by St *Paul*; and Remarkable it is, that in One Passage of his Epistles the Word is taken both in *Phalaris*'s *following*, and Dr *Bentley*'s *persecuting* Sense, within the Compass of two Lines: φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες· Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· *Rom.* XII. 13, 14. Now let *Phalaris* shift for himself; but I am agen concern'd to put in one word for our *Apostle*. Would Dr *Bentley* give himself Time to consider, he would find, that Διώκω, in all its various acceptations still implies the Notion of *Following*: sometimes the Thing *follow'd* has reason to fly and fear the Follower; and then it signifies to *pursue* in Dr *Bentley*'s sense: but sometimes the Thing *follow'd* is less shy and timerous; and then it signifies barely *to follow*. *Theocritus* says,

Ἃ αἶξ τὸ κύτισον, ὁ λύκος τὰν αἶγα διώκει.

Now tho' the *Kid* might be afraid of the *Wolf*, yet the *Cytisus* is not so apt to run away from the *Kid*: and *Virgil* therefore, who understood the force of a Greek Word as well as Dr *Bentley*, translates it thus,

——— *Lupus ipse Capellam,*
Florentem Cytisum sequitur *lasciva Capella.*

where the Word *sequitur*, which is of it self Indifferent, is, as the Greek Word Διώκει is in *Theocritus*'s Verse, determin'd to signifie differently by the several things to which it is apply'd. In much the same sense it is us'd by *Aristotle*, throughout his Ethicks, wherever he has occasion to express a pursuit after Honour, Riches, Pleasure, Virtue, and many such Objects, which are under no fearful apprehensions of the pursuer. If Dr *Bentley* be not yet convinc'd, I refer him for his farther satisfaction to *Plato* (a), and *Dionysius Halicarnasseus* (b); and I desire him particularly to consider those Words of *Xenophon*, in the Memoirs of *Socrates*, χρὴ τοὺς φιλαιτίους φεύγειν, καὶ τοὺς εὐγνώμονας διώκειν, which, according to the little Skill I have in Greek, is to be translated thus; *We ought to fly the Men of a Troublesome Temper, and to court the Candid.* But if διώκειν here signified *to persecute*;

(a) Ταῦτα τοῦν, ὦ Κέβης, ('Tis *Socrates* speaks) Εὐηνῷ φράζε, καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι, καὶ ἂν σωφρονῇ, ἐμὲ διώκειν· ἄπειμι δὲ, ὡς ἔοικε, τήμερον· κελεύουσι γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι· Phæd.

(b) Ὀλίγου ὕστερον ἐδίωκεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν· *Faustulus* follow'd *Romulus* into the City. *P.* 52.

cute, then φεύγω, which is oppos'd to it, would signifie *to court*; and so indeed we should have a Precept for Courting Dr *Bentley*.

He instances agen in these words, παίδων ἐρασταὶ, which in one of the Epistles are meant to express *Lovers of their Children*; whereas, says he, *this of Old would have been taken for a Flagitious Love of Boys*; and he would argue from thence, that this use of the word must be introduc'd by some Modern Sophist. Now to Me the Argument seems to lye quite the other way; and since the words παίδων ἐρασταὶ and παιδεραστὴ were, in latter times, of such infamous usage, 'tis not to be imagin'd, that a Sophist should put 'em into *Phalaris*'s Mouth, to express *the Love of Children*: but 'tis very conceivable, that this in *Phalaris*'s time might be an innocent Expression; tho' afterwards, as *Greece* grew lewder, it had a Double Meaning, and was therefore not fit to be us'd. I'm sure, I can give a better reason for my conjecture, than the Dr can for his; and it is this: Whenever *Phalaris* has occasion to express the *Scandalous Love of Boys*, he does not use this word, as Later Authors do; he calls *Lycinus* (Ep. IV.) πόρνον ἐν παισὶ, but not παιδεραστὴν; which, if the Word had then born as Vile a sense as it did afterwards, he would probably have done: for he had a little of Dr *Bentley* in him at that time, and was bestowing the very worst Names he could think of upon his Adversaries. Besides, παίδων ἐρασταὶ, and παιδεραστὰ sound very differently; and if we take the Whole Sentence in *Phalaris* together, πολλοὶ παίδων ὄντες ἐρασταὶ τοσούτους πόθους οὐκ ἔχον εἰς τέκνα, the Connexion plain-

ly shews, that παῖδα ἐρᾶν can have no ill meaning. Nay, long after *Phalaris*'s time, we have Instances where these Words are employ'd in a Vertuous Sense: *Plato* uses 'em so almost every where; particularly in his Συμπόσιον they recurr often, and under a Chaste meaning *, if *Plato*'s own word may be taken for it. If Dr *Bentley* thinks otherwise, and dares say so, I leave him to be scourg'd by Mr *Norris*, and the rest of the *Platonists*.

* Πάντως μὲν ὁ τοιοῦτος παιδεραστὴς τε καὶ φιλεραστὴς γένοιτ' ἄν, εἰ τὴν ξυγγενείαν ἀσπάζοιτο, says one of the Persons in that Dialogue. Who immediately afterwards professes, that he meant not these Words of a *Lascivious Love*: εἰδὼς δὲ ἂν ἀξίωσιν τοῦτ' εἶναι ἃ νῦν ἐρωτικῶς ἐπαινοῦμεν, ὡς ὄρα τοὺς τοιούτους ἐπὶ σῶμα χαίρειν ἐρᾶν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, οὐκ ἐπὶ μεγάλης ἀνοίας· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ βλέπειν ἐκάστοις ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιστον ἔδει, &c. *p.* 192. In the same manner τὰ παιδικὰ, which generally had a Scandalous Sense, is by *Plato* often us'd in a Good one: particularly in his *Phædrus*; where *Socrates* calls *Lysias* the Orator τὰ παιδικὰ, *Phædri Delicias*, because of *Phædrus*'s admiring and delighting in *Lysias*'s Orations. *Dec.* p. 236.

Till I am at leisure to look out for more Authorities, I hope *Plato* may be thought considerable enough to countenance *Phalaris* in the use of this Expression: but the Dr has still a Proof in reserve, which he takes to be the most distinguishing Mark of a Late Writer. Θυγάτριον (Ep. CXLII) is us'd for *Maidens*: this, he says, is *a most manifest token of a Later Greek*; *even* Tzetzes *interprets it* Θυγατέρας: that is, (if I can make any Sense of what he says) this Use of the Word is so modern, that even *Tzetzes* himself was asham'd so to employ it, and therefore put Θυγατέρας instead of it. But if *Tzetzes*'s Judgment may go for any thing, he's of my side; for he cites the Epistles as Genuine: and therefore to be sure did not substitute Θυγατέρας in the

room

room of θυγατέρας, because he thought this sense of the word Modern. And here again I must put the Dr in mind of his Bible. For in the LXX we find, πολλαὶ θυγατέρες ἐκτήσαντο πλοῦτον, (*Prouz* xxxi. 29.) where θυγατέρες must mean *Women*, or *Maidens*: But these Maidens were *Somebody's Daughters*; and so, I suppose, were those that *Phalaris* presented to his Friend. The same Expression recurrs too in the Evangelists, where they tell us what our Saviour said to the Woman that touch'd the Hem of his Garment; St *Matthew* has it, θάρσει θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε; and St *Mark*, θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε. I need not go farther for Instances, since 'tis probable that this Criticism is altogether founded on a mistake; and what we now read θυγατέρας in the modern MSS of *Phalaris*, was in the more ancient ones contractedly written θερας, which might be read either θυγατέρας, or θεραπαίνας, as the Copyer chanc'd to hit upon it. *Tzetzes* therefore might truly *read*, and not *interpret* it θεραπαίνας; and (as it has often happen'd in Other Cases) this True Reading, which is corrupted in the entire MS of the Author, be preserv'd in this cited Passage of him. If our great Dealer in MSS did not observe this, where is his Sagacity? If he observ'd it, without owning it, where is his Sincerity? He must give me leave now and then to ask him an Insulting Question; He has ask'd me a great many. But I have One Enquiry more to make of him on this occasion; and that is, Whether he thinks, that his *Philosophical Lectures* serve more to the establishment of Religion, than his *Criticisms* do to overthrow it? For is he not Positive, that the Idioms of the Letters prove them to be

a Thousand Years later than Phalaris? And are not some of these very Idioms frequently to be met with both in the *Gospels* and *Epistles*? Should not so Profound a Grecian and Divine as He is have look'd a little into the New Testament, before he had pronounc'd such rash and groundless Assertions? Could Men imagine One, who writes at this rate, to have any Meaning, they would think he had a very ill one: but the whole management of this Controversie clears him from all suspicions of Meaning and Design.

These are all the *Marks of Novity*, which he has given himself the trouble to take notice of; *They that will search*, he says, *may find more of this sort*: without question they may; but if they don't find some of *another sort*, they'll have the Discretion to keep their Discoveries to themselves, and not expose 'em to be corrected by every one that can turn an *Index*, or a *Lexicon* (*a*). By such Helps as these, 'twould be easie to collect Authorities in abundance against every Instance that Dr *Bentley* has brought on this head: but I am so far from valuing my self upon a multitude of Quotations, that I wish there had been no occasion for those few I have produc'd; and think I am oblig'd to excuse my self to the Reader for that mixture of Latin and Greek, with which I am forc'd to vary this Odd Work of mine. I can only say, that I have been as sparing in this way as Dr *Bentley* would give me leave to be: and I have the rather avoided being tedious upon the Particular Point in debate between us,

(*a*) *Nec sanè quisquam est tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non Indicem certè ex Bibliothecâ sumptum transferre in Libros suos possit.* Quint. Instit. *l.* 10, *c.* 1.

us, that I might have room to examine the General Reflection which he has made upon the Change and Decay of Languages.

It is eaſie (ſays the Dr) *from the very turn and faſhion of the Style to diſtinguiſh a freſh Engliſh Compoſition from another a hundred Years old. Now there are as real and ſenſible Differences in the* Greek; *were there as many that could diſcern them. But very few are ſo vers'd and practis'd in that Language, as ever to arrive at that Subtilty of Taſt* *. I can eaſily grant, that the *Engliſh* Tongue has undergone very conſiderable and ſurprizing Changes, eſpecially in this Laſt Century; till about the middle of which, we did not in good earneſt ſet about the Cultivating and Refining it: and then carried our Improvements ſo far, that Some who wrote at the beginning of this Century are not now eaſily underſtood. At our beſt, We are perhaps a little too fond of adopting Foreign Words; and fancying, out of a Modeſty peculiar to our Nation, that we have not ſtock enough of our own, are continually borrowing from our Neighbours: and this brings a great many New Phraſes in upon us, and conſequently antiquates a great many others. Beſides, we have few things in our Tongue writ with any tolerable Degree of perfection; and They therefore who would write or ſpeak well, have no Patterns to look up to, no ſure Rule, but the preſent Mode of the Age, to guide themſelves by: and as faſt as That alters therefore, the Manner of writing muſt alter along with it. But now, if Dr *Bentley* pretends to point out as *Real and Senſible Differences* in the ſeveral Ages of the

* Diſſer. p. 52.

Greek, as a moderate Critic may in the *English*, I'm afraid his *Subtilty of Taste* will find him. Does he take the *Greek* of *Lucian* to be as different from that of *Plato*, as our *English* Now is from that which was spoken soon after the Conquest? Are not *Homer* and *Oppian* much nearer one another in their Language than *Chaucer* and *Cowly*; tho' in Time they are far more distant? No body is so absurd as to say, that the Greek Tongue did not admit of some few Alterations in Every Age: but 'twas incomparably the most fix'd and enduring of any that we are generally acquainted with: and I shall offer at Some Reasons, that gave it this remarkable advantage over other Languages. 'Twas early improv'd and adorn'd by Men of the greatest Genius that ever appear'd in the World; They polish'd and perfected it to that degree, that it was admirably fitted to all the Purposes of Speech, and Ways of Writing imaginable: They wrought it up into all the Majesty and Grace, all the Sweetness and Smoothness that an Happy Composition of Words, an Harmonious mixture of Vowels, Diphthongs, and Consonants, or a Just Cadency of Syllables could give it. The best Greek Writers had generally Skill in Music; which was infus'd into 'em from their Infancy, and none were reckon'd well-bred that wanted it. This made their Ear just, and fine: and the fineness of their Ear easily slid into their Tongue; model'd their Speech, and made it Tuneable. They brought all the Learning in the World into their Language; and wrote in the best manner, upon all the most useful and pleasing Subjects, that could bene-

benefit, or entertain Mankind. The Natural Perfection of their Tongue, and the distinguishing Excellency of their Authors in all Kinds of Knowledge, and Ways of Writing, made 'em a Compleat Standard and Model to other Nations, and after-Ages; upon which every one endeavour'd to form himself: So that what was sure always to be lik'd, could not chuse but last long. Their Empire also did not a little contribute to the Stability and Prevalence of their Language: They overcame a Great part of the World, and extended their Tongue by their Conquests, as they had done before by their Commerce. All Nations borrow'd from Them, but They had that Contempt of the Barbarity of other Countries, that they were shy of suffering either their Manners, or their Speech to be introduc'd among 'em. This Pride they preserv'd in a great measure, even when the *Roman* Empire was at its utmost heighth; and while *Rome* flourish'd with the Glory of Arms, the Seat of Learning still continu'd at *Athens*. This kept the Language so far entire and unmix'd, that we have *Greek* Books writ by Authors at almost Two thousand Years distance, who disagree less in their Phrase and Manner of Speech, than the Books of any Two *English* Writers do, who liv'd but Two hundred Years asunder. This then was a Peculiar Happiness of the *Greek* Tongue; No other Language, that has been of known and familiar use in the World, not even the *Latin* it self, enjoy'd any thing like it. An 150 or 200 Years was the utmost Length of Time that the Latin Purity continu'd. And therefore,

to *Compare* the *Greek*, the most Holding Tongue in the World, with the *English*, the most Fickle and Fleeting of any; and to *Infer* from the observable difference between the several Ages of English, that there was as great a Difference between the several Ages of Greek; is a *Comparison* and an *Inference*, which No-body, but Dr *Bentley*, would have allow'd himself to make: that is, (to be plain with him) No-body but One, who has no true Relish, no nice Taste of the Beauties and Proprieties of Either of these Languages; or of any Other, that he has yet pretended to judge of, or to write in. By those *Mark and Moles of Novity* which he has pointed out in the Paragraph we are upon, the Reader is by this time satisfied, how able he is to assign to every Greek Writer his proper Age and Period, meerly by the *Thread and Colour of his Style*. Indeed, tho' he has the Vanity to declare this to be his Extraordinary Faculty, yet he has withal the Modesty *not to hope that he shall convince any body* (*a*); and in this, I dare say, he is not mistaken. For 'tis somewhat hard to imagine, how a Man should enter into the Spirit and Delicacy, and all the Various Niceties of a Dead Tongue, who is so far from having any exquisite sense of these things, even in that very Tongue, which he was born and bred up in. I shall take an occasion by and bye to give the Reader such a Specimen of his English Eloquence, as will discourage any body (if there be any body left, who is not yet discourag'd) from chusing Him for a Taster. In the mean time, to stay the Reader's Longing, I shall instance in One Hap-

(*a*) Differ. p. 52.

Happy Phraſe, newly minted by the Dr in this very Paragraph: he ſpeaks here of the *Mien of a Face*; which, as I take it, is much the ſame thing with the *Behaviour of a Look*, or the *Carriage of a Smile*: I do not know how particular the Dr's *Mien*, or his *Face*, may be; for, to my knowledge, I never ſaw him; but the *Mien of the Face* of his Style the Reader muſt allow me, even from this ſingle inſtance, is ſomewhat extraordinary!

THE Uſe of the *Attic Dialect* was made one ſhrewd Objection againſt *Phalaris*; the Uſe of the *Attic Talent*, Dr *Bentley* is reſolv'd, ſhall be another. This Way of Counting recurrs pretty often in the Epiſtles; however not ſo often, as that an Argument built upon it ſhould deſerve to be rank'd among *the General Proofs*: but I am ſo little ſenſible of the force of it, that I am willing to allow it a place there; and if Dr *Bentley* can make it out, I promiſe to renounce, not thoſe Particular Epiſtles only from whence 'tis taken, but the Whole Sett of them.

The Dr, upon this Article, accuſes his *Mock Phalaris* of miſtaking the *Sicilian Talent*: and this Miſtake of his, he, with his uſual Gaiety, calls *a Slippery Way of telling Mony* (*a*); and therefore cautions us againſt *dealing with him* (*b*). He explains himſelf thus:—That the *Sicilian Talent* was the Loweſt of any; that *Phalaris* promiſing in his Epiſtles to ſeveral of his Countrymen Talents in General, muſt be underſtood to mean *Sicilian* Ta-

(*a*) Differ. p. 53.
(*b*) Ibid. p. 54.

Talents, whereas he means nothing like it. *Now* (ſays the Dr) *if a Bargain were made in* England, *to pay ſo many* Pounds; *or* Marks; *and the Party ſhou'd pretend at laſt, that he meant* Scots Marks, *or* French Livres; *few, I ſuppoſe, would care to have Dealings with him. And this* *Diſſ. p. 54 *is the very Caſe in ſo many of theſe Letters.* So far from being the Caſe, that the Caſe is juſt contrary! For if the *Sicilian* Talents were ſo very Low, and *Phalaris* muſt be thought to intend them in his Promiſes, and yet paid *Attic* ones; Thoſe he dealt with had certainly no reaſon to complain of him. Would a man think himſelf ill us'd in *Scotland*, who ſhould have a General Promiſe made him of ſo many *Pounds*, which he expected to be made good in the *Pounds* of the Country; and receiv'd 'em afterwards in good *Engliſh Sterling?* What could poſſibly give this Perverſe Turn even to Dr *Bentley*'s Imagination? What Cloudy Author had he been converſing with, that could put him into this State of Perplexity and Confuſion? We have great hopes indeed that the Intricate Accounts of this Paragraph ſhould be clear'd up, by ſuch an Head, in ſuch Order! But, it may be, the Dr did not intend this for a Remark that was to Edifie his Reader; but for a pure piece of harmleſs Diverſion. Having therefore ſported himſelf a little, he reſumes the Chair, and thus authoritatively dictates to us.

We are to know, that in Sicily, *as in moſt other Countries, the Name and Value of their Coins, and the way of reckoning by Summs, was peculiar. The Sum* Talent, *in the* Sicilian *Accompt, contain'd no more in Specie than Three* Attic *Drachms,*

of Roman *Denares*; *as plainly appears from* Ariſtotle*, *in his now loſt Treatiſe of the* Sicilian Government. *And the Words of* Feſtus *are moſt expreſs*; Talentorum non unum Genus: Atticum eſt ſex millium Denariûm, Syracuſanum trium denariûm. *What an Immenſe Difference! One* Attic *Talent had the real value of two thouſand* Sicilian *Talents. Now in all theſe Epiſtles the very Circumſtances aſſure us, that by the word* Talent *ſimply nam'd, the* Attic *Talent is underſtood. But ſhould not our wiſe Sophiſt have known, that a* Talent, *in that Country where he had laid the Scene of his Letters, was quite another thing? Without Queſtion, if the true* Phalaris *had penn'd them, he would have reckon'd theſe Summs by the* Sicilian *Talents, encreaſing only the Number: Or ſhould he have made uſe of the* Attic *Accompt, he ſhould always have given expreſs notice of it; never ſaying* τάλαντον *alone, without the addition of* Ἀττικὸν (a).

* *Pollux, l.* ix, *c.* 6.

(a) Diſſ. p. 54, 55.

Now, in oppoſition to the Dr's Reaſonings and Authorities about this matter of the *Talents*, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, that what the Dr ſays *we are to know*, we are ſtill *to know*, after all the Information he has vouchſaf'd to give us; and that if we did *know* it, we could not from thence gather, that theſe Epiſtles are Spurious. For if there is room to ſuſpect that the Dr's Witneſſes are corrupted, if their Teſtimony is inconſiſtent, if they tell us things demonſtratively falſe, if the Dr ſays more than his Witneſſes do, if there be ſtronger Authority to counterbalance theirs; if, admitting what they ſay, or what the Dr makes 'em ſay, to be true, the Letters may be nevertheleſs Authentic: if theſe things can be

made

made good, the Dr will, I hope, pardon me, if I refuſe to part with *Phalaris*, upon any Quarrel about the *Talents*.

The Dr's Witneſſes are *Pollux*, and *Feſtus*, whom I ſhall examine ſeverally. *Ariſtotle* indeed is call'd in for a Witneſs; but He not appearing in Perſon, we have his Teſtimony only at ſecond-hand: ſo that its force will wholly depend on the Authority of *Pollux*, the Relater. To Him we are referr'd in the Margin; but it doth not appear from the Book and Chapter there cited, that the Treatiſe of *Ariſtotle* which, the Dr ſays, is *now Loſt*, was ever *found*. That *Ariſtotle* wrote Πολιτείας, or accounts of the State and Polity of ſeveral Particular Cities, and of ſeveral *Sicilian* Cities among the reſt, is ſufficiently known *: but that he wrote any thing which bore ſuch a Title as *a Treatiſe of the Sicilian Government*, we want the Light of ſome other Loſt Treatiſe to make plain to us. A Treatiſe of *Ariſtotle*, but not under this Name, is cited by *Pollux* in this Chapter; but whether that part of this Chapter which concerns the Value of *Talents* be genuine, we have Room to doubt. *Seberus*, in his Notes on *Pollux*, tells us, that from *Pag.* 435, *v.* 32, of his Edition, to the End of the 6th Chapter, (within which ſpace all that is ſaid of *Talents* lies) is wanting in One MS. But allowing it to be genuine, what the Dr ſays is plain from that place in *Pollux*, is ſo far from being plain from thence, that *Pollux* muſt be chang'd and help'd out from other Authors, before he can

* Πολιτείαι πόλεων δυοῖν δεούσαιν ἑκατὸν ἃ καὶ ἐσῴθη, καὶ ἰδίᾳ δημοκρατικαὶ, ὀλιγαρχικαὶ, ἀριστοκρατικαὶ, καὶ τυραννικαί. Diog. in Vitâ Arist.

can be made to speak to the purpose. It plainly appears to the Dr from *Aristotle*, as there cited by *Pollux*, that *the Summ* Talent *in the* Sicilian *Accompt contain'd no more in Specie than three* Attic *Drachms, or* Roman *Denares.* But tho' the *Sicilian* Talent be there mention'd, 'tis neither adjusted to *Attic* Drachms, nor *Roman* Denares (*a*). Two sorts of *Sicilian* Talents are there taken notice of; an Ancient, and a Later: That equal to 24 *Nummi*, This to 12. And the *Nummus* is said to be equal to three ὁμόλια. So that before the Value of the *Sicilian Talent* can be settled from this Passage, the Value of the *Nummus* should be first agreed on; which it will not be very easie to fix from its given proportion to the ὁμόλια, because that is a Species of Mony we are Strangers to; and the Criticks are agreed we owe that Coin purely to a Corrupt Reading of the Text: (which, by the bye, is much such an Instance of *Equivocal Generation*, as that which the Dr tells us of *, where he makes *Mushrooms to grow out of a Rotten Passage in* Suidas). Some therefore for ὁμόλια read ὀβόλια, others ἡμιοβόλια. This Latter must be own'd to be a greater departure from the Letter of the Text than the Former; so that if we admit it, in order to our settling the value of the *Nummus*, and consequently of the *Talent*, we do not owe our Light in this matter to what we read in *Pollux*, but to what we gather from our

(*a*) Τὸ μέντοι Σικελικὸν τάλαντον ἐλάγιστον ἴσχυε· τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει, τέσσαρας καὶ εἴκοσι τοὺς νούμμους· τὸ δὲ ὕστερον δυοκαίδεκα· δύνασθαι δὲ τὸν νοῦμμον τρία * ὁμόλια.
Poll. *l.* 9, *c.* 6.

* Dissert. *p.* 118.

our own Conjectures, or from other Authors. When we have put ἡμιοβόλια for ὁμόλια, 'tis granted, that the *Nummus*, which is equal to three *half-Obolus's*, or one *Obolus* and an half, is the same with the *Nummus Sestertius* of the *Romans*: the value of which being known from other Authors, and its proportion to the *Roman Denare*; the proportion of the *Sicilian Talent* to the *Roman Denare* is thereby made out. But those who go this way to work in setling the value of the *Sicilian* Talent from this obscure and corrupted passage, seem to take it for granted, that the Greek word νοῦμμος in *Pollux* means the Roman *Nummus*, or *Sestertius*; and then adjust the obscure word ὁμόλια (by changing it into ἡμιοβόλια) to the known value of the *Sestertius*. But *Pollux* tells us, that tho' * νοῦμμος may seem to be a *Roman* Name of Mony, yet it is a *Greek* one, and a Term of the *Dorians* in *Italy* and *Sicily*. And if so, 'tis more probable that the *Sicilian Talent* is here compar'd to the *Dorian* or *Sicilian Nummi*, whatever those were, than to the *Roman Sestertii*. Had *Pollux* given us the Value of the *Sicilian* Talent in his own Name and Words, we might have suppos'd that he adjusted it to the *Roman* Monies; but 'tis absurd to think that *Aristotle*, whose words † are here cited for the value of the Talent, should give it us in *Roman Sestertii*, which were a Coin not stamp'd at *Rome*, till after *Aristotle's*

* Ὁ δὲ νοῦμμος δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι Ῥωμαίων τοὔνομα τοῦ νομίσματος· ἔστι δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ Σικελίᾳ Δωρίεων. *L.* 9, *C.* 6.

† Τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει, καὶ νούμμους, &c. ut supra.

Socles time (*a*). So that the Ground upon which the receiv'd Computation of the *Sicilian Talent* ſeems to have been made, plainly fails. But admitting the *Nummus* here to be the ſame with the *Roman Seſtertius*, which we have good reaſon not to admit; and that ἑξήκοντα is rightly ſubſtituted, which we have no reaſon to grant: yet after all, Dr *Bentley* has impos'd upon us in his valuation of the *Sicilian Talent*. For the Value of the more Ancient *Sicilian Talent*, which is equal to 24 *Nummi* or *Seſtertii*, will be equivalent not to *Three*, but to *Six Roman Denares*, or *Attic Drachms*; it being agreed on all hands, that each *Seſtertius* is one fourth part of a *Denare* or *Drachm*: ſo that the Dr has ſunk the value of the *Sicilian Talent* (admitting this Computation) half in half. The Later *Sicilian* Talent will indeed at this rate be, as the Dr puts it; but the more Ancient one will be double its Value. But tho' the Dr in his way of *telling Money* after *Pollux*, ſlips the Old Talent, (which it had been fair to have taken notice of, ſince *Phalaris* muſt be ſuppos'd to reckon by thoſe Talents that were moſt ancient) and gives us the value only of the *Later* one; yet the difference between theſe Two Talents is not, I own, ſo great, as to be worth contending for: ſince 'tis freely acknowledg'd, that the Talents mention'd in *Phalaris* muſt be put at a higher rate than even the greater *Sicilian Talent*, if that

(*a*) Who liv'd *Olymp.* cxiv, 3. according to *Laertius*. And *Pliny* tells us, *Argentum ſignatum eſt Annis urbis* 585, (others read 485) *Quinto Fabio Conſule, 5 annis ante primum Punicum bellum.* Nat. Hiſt. *l.* 33. And it is generally underſtood by the Writers *de Re Nummariâ* that *Seſtertii* were then firſt coin'd.

Now *A. V. C.* 585, falls in with *Ol.* 153. *A. V. C.* 485, with *Ol.* 128.

that was worth no more than *Six Roman Denares*, or *Attic Drachms*. The value of a *Denare*, or *Drachm*, is computed by all Authors, and may be prov'd by the Scales to be equal to 7 *d. ob.* so that six of these will amount to 3 *s.* 9 *d.* the Price, as is pretended, of the Greater *Sicilian* Talent: and Three of them, to half that Summ, 1 *s.* 10 *d. ob.* the value of Dr *Bentley*'s Talent. But now if *Pollux* had expresly told me from *Aristotle*, that these were the several Values of the Two *Sicilian* Talents, I should have made some difficulty of giving him any Credit in this matter. For I find, that the same *Pollux*, as we now have him, cites *Aristotle* for things of this nature, which even upon *Aristotle*'s Authority I cannot admit. He tells us from *Aristotle* (*a*), that the *Sicilians* reckon'd that Two Brass Pieces (χαλκοῖ) were equal to Six *Litra*; and that Six Brass Pieces were equal to half a *Litra*. Now that Two should be twelve times as much as Six, is not according to the receiv'd Rules of Arithmetic: To puzzle us still more, *Pollux* tells us in another place (*b*), from the same Treatise of *Aristotle*, that Six Talents are equal to Two Brass Pieces; and that Three Talents are equal to Three of the same Brass pieces; that is, that Three are more than Six. I beg to be excus'd, if I cannot believe *Pollux*, that *Aristotle* counted at this rate; because I always thought, that

(*a*) Ἐν Ἱμεραίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν (Ἀριστοτέλης) ὡς οἱ μὲν Σικελιῶται τοὺς δύο χαλκοῦς ἑξάλιτρα κολοῦσι, τοὺς δὲ ἕξ, ἡμίλιτρον· L. 4, C. 24.

(*b*) Παρ' αὐτῷ (Ἀριστοτέλει) τις ἂν ἐν τῇ Ἱμεραίων πολιτείᾳ καὶ ἄλλα εὕροι Σικελῶν ὀνόματα, οἷς ἠγγίαν, ὅπερ δύναται χαλκοῦν ἕνα· καὶ ἓξ τάλαντα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοῖ, καὶ τρία τάλαντα, ὅπερ τρεῖς L. 9, C. 6.

that *Aristotle* had some little Skill in Mathematicks. It would not perhaps be difficult to offer some Emendations, that might set these things right (*a*): but till that is done, *Pollux*'s Calculations are of no great Credit with me. *Pollux*, in the same place which the Dr cites for his value of the *Talents*, informs us (*b*), that as

(*a*) *Not to be too reserv'd with the Dr, I shall now offer what may set* Pollux *right: and I wish the Dr himself were as capable of* Emendation. *My Conjecture, for I do not pretend to Demonstrate in these matters. is this, — That* ἓξ τάλαντα, *or rather* ἑξατάλαντον, &c. *is an Error of the Copyists for* ἑξάλιτρον, &c *and, that the Compounds of* λίτρα *with the derivatives of* τρεῖς, *and* τέσσαρες, *and* ἕξ, *were such Doric words as signified* τὴ ἐκτὸν, τέτρατον, *and* τρίτον τῆς λίτρας; *like the* Sextans, Quadrans, *and* Triens *of the* Romans; *and were nothing but Two, Three, and Four* Ὀυγκία. *That the* Sicilian *Talent was a piece of Silver, that answer'd in former days to a Talent-weight, or* 60 Litræ *weight of Brass; and that this Quantity of Brass was then divided into* 24 *pieces, call'd* νῦμμοι, *each* νῦμμος *being equal to two pounds and an half of Brass, which the* Romans *would have call'd* Nummus Sestertius; *as they would Four of them, a* Decussis. *That afterwards, Silver falling in Price, compar'd with Brass, it sunk at last so low (and we know from the* Romans *how much more it sunk a long time after) as that the Silver piece call'd formerly a Talent, was now worth only Half what it was, and grown equivalent but to Twelve* Nummi Sestertii, *or three* Decusses; *and that, according to that Value therefore* Festus *(if the present Reading of him prevails) express'd it by Three* Roman Denarii. *That, by this time, little Silver* Litræ *being coin'd, equal, by the Later Value, to a Litra of Brass, and in Quantity to an* Æginean Obolus, *the Nummus Sestertius was consequently equivalent to Two and an Half of those* Litræ *or* Oboli, *that is, to a* τρίτον ἡμιοβόλιον, *to be understood, as* Pollux *himself will direct in that Chapter: And that so, I suppose, it might have been express'd by* Aristotle, *and should be read in* Pollux.

(*b*) *He tells us expressly, that the* Mina *of each Country is divided into* 100 *Drachms of that Country.* Ἡ μνᾶ δὲ ὡς παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἑκατὸν οἶχον δραχμὰς Ἀττικὰς, οὕτω καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὰς ἐπιχωρίους δυναμένας πρὸς λόγον τοῦ καθ' ἕκαστον ταλάντου κατ' τε προσθήκην, καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν. L. 9, C. 6. *And if the* Drachmæ *of each Country rise and fall in proportion to the* Talent, *it is evident, that there are as many Hundreds of of them, that is, as many* Minæ, *in one Talent as in another. And so* Brerewood *understands* Pollux: Omne *Talentum*, ut *Suidas* & *Pollux* inquiunt, continet Minas 60, ut Mina Drachmas 100. Proinde 6000 Drachmas continebat Talentum Omne proprias scil. ejus regionis, cujus Talentum esse dicebatur. *De Nummis*, p. 26.

Talentum quodvis sexmillia Drachmarum sui generis habet, quæ ad Atticas reductæ variant. *Gron. de Pec. Vet.* c. 3.

the *Attic Talent* was divided into Sixty *Attic Minæ*, and each of those *Minæ* into an Hundred *Attic Drachms*, so the *Talent* of each Country was divided into the same number of *Minæ*; and each *Mina* into the same number of *Drachms*, proportionably to the value of the several Talents. So that the *Sicilian Mina*, the 60th part of the greater *Sicilian Talent*, will at this rate be just Three Farthings of our Money; and the *Sicilian Drachm*, the hundredth part of that minute Summ, *i. e.* more than three and thirty times less than our Farthing. Now it cannot easily be imagin'd, that the *Sicilian Drachm*, which was a Coin current amongst them, should be so unconceivably little as it must be, if its value were but the three and thirtieth part of our Farthing: and yet we must not stop here, but must carry our Imagination further, and still break that Particle of Metal into Two Parts, if we would reach the Littleness of that other Drachm which answers to the Lesser, or Dr *Bentley*'s Talent; being not quite the 66th part of our Farthing, and that in Silver too: a Species of Mony, not to be counted without the help of Microscopes. So that when we have occasion hereafter to express the Value, or rather worthlessness, of any contemptible Performance, we shall in compliment to the Dr's Criticism say, it is not worth a *Sicilian Drachm*.

I beg the Reader's Patience, while I take a Review of what has been said in answer to the Dr's First Authority. The Value of the *Sicilian* Talent *appears clearly* to him from a *Lost Treatise*, which he owns has long since disappear'd, and which I think never did appear: That part of *Pollux*, where he finds the Remains of this Lost Treatise, is of suspected Cre-

Credit. If it is Genuine, it is Imperfect; and to be ſupply'd by Gueſs. The Supplys which have been made to it ſeem to have been built upon a Wrong Suppoſition, that the ῥωμῃ in *Pollux* was a *Roman* Word. When theſe Supplements are admitted, they do not ſink the Talent in diſpute quite ſo low as the Dr doth. *Pollux*, whoſe Authority we muſt depend upon for this Citation from *Ariſtotle*, cites things of this nature from him which, as they there ſtand, are demonſtrably falſe. In his Diviſion of the Talent, he breaks it into pieces, which, admitting the Dr's Rate of the Talent, are of no Value, and of no Uſe.

If this Plea (for the Length of which I beg the Reader's pardon) is ſufficient to invalidate the Authority of *Pollux*, the Teſtimony of *Feſtus* will admit of an eaſier Diſpatch. For, not to inſiſt on any of thoſe Exceptions againſt *Pollux*, which affect *Feſtus* equally with Him, it is obſervable that the Book which we now have under the Name of *Feſtus*, is not the Work of *Feſtus*, but compos'd out of ſome Fragments of *Feſtus*, and an *Epitome* of *Feſtus*, which *Paulus Diaconus*, a mean Writer *, whoſe Picture *Scaliger* has ſo drawn, as if an Acquaintance of mine had ſate for it, made in *Charles the Great*'s time. The Original *Feſtus*, if we had him entire, was but an Epitome of *Verrius Flaccus*; and *Scaliger* thinks it a Juſt Judgment upon *Feſtus*, for having abridg'd *Flaccus*, that his Epitome was Epitomiz'd by ſo Ignorant a Creature as *Paulus*. But, what is moſt to our Purpoſe, thoſe that give us theſe words

* *Paulus Longobardus, homo confidentiſſimus ac ineptiſſimus; nihil Feſto pejus potuit accidere, quam quod in hujus Pauli manus inciderit.* Joſ. Scal. *in* Ep. Ded. ad Caſtigationes in Feſtum.

of *Feſtus*, (if they be His) which the Dr ſays are *expreſs* to his point; take care to warn us, that for *Syracuſanum trium Denariûm*, we ought to read, *Syracuſanum trium millium Denariûm*. Which Error may be ſuppos'd eaſily to have crept into the Copies of *Feſtus*, by leaving out the Capital Letter M, between the Words *Tri-um* and *Denariûm*.

I have conſulted all the Editions of *Feſtus* I could meet with, and find none * which doth not take notice of this Emendation; and This the Dr could not be a Stranger to: and had *He* therefore been a *Fair Dealer* in this matter, *Feſtus* had not been quoted at ſuch a Looſe Rate, to prove *Phalæris* a *foal* one.

* See *Gothofredi Notæ ad Schedas Feſti fragmento detractas*, p. 234.

See the ſame *Gothofredus*'s Notes upon *Feſtus*, p. 1821.

See St *Andrew*'s Edition of *Feſtus*, where, in the Text, 'tis *trium Denariûm*, but in the Margin, *trium Millium*.

See *Antonius Auguſtinus*'s Notes upon *Feſtus*, at the word *Talenta*; where he ſays, *Mendoſum hic Locus eſt, & qui non patitur Emendationem. Hoc unum certum eſt, Talentorum non unum eſſe Genus, & Atticum eſſe Sex Millium Denariûm: Cætera incerta ſunt.*

See Dr *Bernard*, *de Ponderibus & Menſuris*, who ſuppoſes the Talent of *Syracuſe* to be of 3000 Denares, and quotes *Feſtus* for it.

See *Dacier*'s Notes upon *Feſtus*.

The Opinion which the Dr would have us entertain of his Great Reading would have been better confirm'd, had he ſupported his Notion of the Low Value of the *Sicilian* Talent by good Authorities taken from approv'd *Sicilian* Writers, or others that purpoſely treat of *Sicilian* Affairs. But, whether the Dr knows it or not, he had good reaſon to decline the teſtimony of thoſe, who ſo plainly declare againſt him. For they give us better Grounds for ſetting an higher Price on the *Talent*, by which

Si-

Sicilian Authors us'd to reckon, than *Pollux* and *Festus* could give us for placing it so low; tho' they had been more expres to the Dr's purpose than they are.

Diodorus a *Sicilian*, writing of *Sicilian* Affairs, frequently uses the word *Talent*, without any Addition; which therefore, according to the Dr, must mean the *Sicilian*: and which yet, by the Circumstances, must have as great a Price put upon it, as the *Talents* mention'd by *Phalaris* require. He tells us, that *Agathocles* being possess'd of a Garrison of the *Messenians* in *Sicily*, offer'd to surrender it to 'em for thirty Talents (*a*). Here a *Sicilian* Writer speaking of a Contract between the Prince of one *Sicilian* Town, and People of another, mentions *Talents*, which must be the *Sicilian*, according to Dr *Bentley*'s Reasoning; but must not be *Sicilian*, according to his Computation. For by his Reckoning, a Garrison, upon a fair bargain, was to be parted with for less than Three pounds: which, if it be true, 'tis probable *Agathocles* got less by selling his Garrisons, than his Pots.

(*a*) Ἀγαθοκλῆς ὁ τῶν Συρακουσίων δυνάστης κατέχων φρούριον τῶν Μεσσηνίων ἐπηγγείλατο λαβὼν παρ' αὐτῶν τριάκοντα τάλαντα παραδώσειν τὸ τόπον.

Diod. Sic. *l.* 19.

Agen *Diodorus* tells us, that *Gorgias* the famous Rhetorician of *Leontium* (*b*), had One hundred *Mina* a-piece from his Scholars, (*Sicilian Mina* they must be, according to the Dr) for teaching 'em his Art. This, tho' taken notice of by the Historian as an Extraordinary Price, was very inconsiderable Pay (*c*) for so great a

(*b*) Γοργίας ὁ Ῥητωρ διδάσκων λόγους πολὺ παρέσχεν παρὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῶν μνᾶς ἑκατόν.

ἡ τύχη ἱστορικὰς ἀφῶτος ἐξεῦρε, καὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ σωτῆρα τὸν τοῦτον τῆς ἄλλης ὑφ' ἑλλάδος ὄντα μισθὸν λαμβάνειν οὐδὲ ἕν μαθητῶν μνᾶς ἑκατόν. L. 12. (*c*) It amounts to 3 *s.* 1 *d.* ob. of our Mony.

Master; unless we may suppose, that he taught at different Prices, in proportion to the Improvements of his Scholars; and then I can allow the Dr that there is a sort of Eloquence, which had been too dear a Purchase even at that rate.

From the same Author we learn (*a*) that the *Syracusians*, after a signal Victory, gave One *Mina* to each of their Subjects, that had behav'd themselves well in the Fight. The Relator of this is a *Sicilian*; those who give, and those who receive the Reward are *Sicilians* of *Syracuse*, the very place from whence the Dr's Low Talent had its Denomination: The Persons honour'd with this Gratuity are such as had distinguish'd themselves by their Bravery; and for their Exemplary Courage, and Eminent Service to their Country they are crown'd, and each of them receives, according to the Dr's Estimation, the *moiety of Three Farthings*. A Noble Donative! for which no doubt the States were often remember'd by the Souldiery in the best Wine of *Syracuse*!

(*a*) μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην οἱ Συρακούσιοι τοὺς μὲν ἐπιλέκτους ὄντας ἐξαμοσίους, αἰτίους γενομένους τῆς νίκης ἐστεφάνωσε, ἀριστεῖα δόντες ἀργυρίου μνᾶν ἑκάστῳ. L. 11.

Theocritus, another *Sicilian* Writer, in one of his *Idylliums*, mentions both *Mina* and *Drachma*. The Persons he introduces speaking (*b*) are two *Syracusian* Ladies; they talk *Doric*,

(*b*)

Γοργώ·

Πραξινόα, μάλα τοι τὸ κατπτυχὲς ἐμπρόναμα
Τοῦτο πρέπει· λέγε μοι, πόσσω κατέβα τοι ἀφ' ἱστῶ;

Πραξινόη·

Μὴ μνάσῃς, Γοργοῖ· πλέον ἀργυρίω καθαρῶ * μνᾶν
Ἢ δύο·

Idyll. ιε·

* *Stephens* in the margin reads μνᾶς·

Doric, the Language of *Syracuse*. The One admires the Others fine Habit, which she had put on upon a Great Festival, to appear at Court in, and asks the Price of it: The Other answers her, that it cost somewhat more than a *Mina* or two; and seems to make an Excuse for her Extravagance: which, if she paid for it in the Dr's Mony, she need not have done, considering they were her Holiday-clothes.

In the same *Idyllium* we have an account of *Five Fleeces* (*) bought for *Seven Drachms*. It is true, we are told it was bad ware: but the Woman had no great Reason to rail at her Husband as a Spendthrift, and an ill Marketman (as we find she doth) if the Whole Purchase fell short of the Eighth part of a Farthing.

It would be easie, if pardonable, to multiply Instances of this Nature from *Sicilian* Writers, or such as treat of things transacted in *Sicily*. A Neighbouring State (*a*) is by a Bribe of 15 Talents (*b*) prevail'd with to forsake the *Agrigentines*, their Allys. Sixty Talents (*c*) are offer'd by the *Egestani* of *Sicily* for a Months pay (*d*) for 60 Ships, which they had occasion to borrow. *Timoleon* (*e*) the Restorer of *Syracuse* to its Liberties and

(*a*) Diod. Sic. *l.* 13.
(*b*) *Less than* 30 *Shillings.*
(*c*) Thucyd. *p.* 353.
(*d*) *A Talent* 1 s. 10 d. ob. *for a Months pay of a Ship.*
(*e*) Plut. in Vitâ Timoleontis.

(*) Χώμὸς ταῦτάγ' ἔχει φθόρος ἀργυρίου, Διοκλείδας·
Ἑπτὰ δραχμῶν κυνάδας, γραίαν ἀποτίλματα πηρᾶν,
Πέντε πέκως ἔλαβ' ἐχθὲς, ἄπαν ῥύπος——

Rights, was magnificently buried by the State, which he had deliver'd, at the Charge of (a) 200 *Minæ*. A raiſe Fund of (b) a Thouſand Talents is rais'd by letting out Ground and Houſes to 60000 men, for the Recruit of *Syracuſe*, after it had been ruin'd by a War (c). *Dion*'s Eſtate, (d) which lay at *Syracuſe*, is reckon'd a Great one; and its full value ſaid to be an *Hundred* (e) *Talents*. Two *Sicilian* Princes (f) ſend 75 Talents to the *Rhodians* (g) for their Relief, after they had been ruin'd by an Earthquake; but could not raiſe ſo great a Sum at once, and therefore ſent it by Parcels. In ſhort, after ſome ſearch into this matter, I am perſwaded no one Inſtance can be produc'd of Talents, or other Moneys mention'd by any *Sicilian* Writer, or any one that writes of *Sicily*, which will countenance or admit of the Low Valuation of the *Sicilian* Talent, that Dr *Bentley* eſpouſes.

(a) 6 *s.* 3 *d.*
(b) *Leſs than* 100 *pounds.*
(c) Plut. ibid.
(d) Plato, *Ep.* 7.
(e) *Leſs than* 10 *pounds.*
(f) Poly. *p.* 249.
(g) *Leſs than* 7 *pounds.*

But becauſe I find the Modern Dealers in ancient Monies go into the Opinion of a *Sicilian* Talent of Low Value, without any other Authority, as I can find, but the obſcure and interpolated Paſſages of *Pollux* and *Feſtus*, I ſhall lay no ſtreſs upon the Exceptions that have been made againſt that Opinion: ſince we may freely admit ſuch a Low Value of this Talent, and yet think theſe Letters Genuine. For there might be a low Value of the *Sicilian* Ta-

Talent in ſome other Age, and yet the Talent of *Phalaris*'s time might be higher. Or there might be a Talent of this Low Value in other parts of *Sicily*, and yet the Talent of *Agrigentum*, a diſtinct State, might be higher. Or there might be a Low Talent of baſer Metal, ſuppoſe Braſs, equal to a *Litra*; and yet the *Silver Talents*, which *Phalaris*'s are expreſly ſaid to be (*b*), might be higher. Or there might be a Low Value us'd by the Natives, and ancient Inhabitants of *Sicily*, and the Talent us'd by the *Greek Colonies* that plac'd themſelves there, might be higher. Or if in *Phalaris*'s time there was a Silver Talent of this Low Value, of uſe among the Greek Colonies, at *Agrigent*, and elſewhere, as poſſibly there might have been a Piece of Silver ſo call'd, becauſe Equivalent to a Talent weight of Braſs; and ſuch *Litra*'s there were we know: yet could it not be properly term'd a Talent of Silver Money, when a Talent was ſimply mention'd, and without ſpecification. For then it muſt mean the Common Talent, not that conſiſting of little Obolary *Litra*, repreſenting Braſs Pounds, but That every where us'd, made of *Litra*, or *Mina* of the ſame Metal, and thoſe divided, each into an 100 *Drachma*, and theſe into *Oboli*: However, if theſe were not to be admitted, yet ſtill the Reaſons that may be offer'd for *Phalaris*'s uſing the *Attic* Dialect (to ſpeak looſely) tho' a *Sicilian*, will juſtifie his reckoning the Talents, as the *Athenians* did. Or if theſe Letters might by a Later hand be chang'd out of the

(*a*) *The Talents in* Pollux, *being compar'd to* χαλκοῖ, *and being, according to the preſent reading of* Pollux, *lower in Value than They, ſeem to be Braſs rather than Silver.*

(*b*) Epp. 118, 95.

Doric

Doric Dialect into the *Attic*, the same hand might make 'em speak *Attic*, in the valuation of the Monies. All these Suppositions must be shewn impossible, before any convincing Argument can be drawn from hence, to prove these Letters Spurious. Or Lastly, tho' none of these Reasonings should hold, 'tis agreed by those, who treat of these matters (*a*), and give us the low Value of the *Sicilian Talent*, that wherever the Word *Talent* is us'd by Greek Writers, without any addition, the *Attic Talent* must be understood. So far are the Learned from thinking, as the Dr doth, that *Phalaris, had he made use of the Attic Account, should always have given express notice of it: and never have said* τάλαντον *alone, without the addition of* Ἀττικόν. For They, who were conversant in other Books beside Dictionaries, were sensible, that *Sicilian* Writers frequently us'd the Word *Talent* in the Attic sense of it, without any such express Limitation. And if Other *Sicilian* Authors might express themselves in this manner, without being suspected as Spurious, *Phalaris* is unjustly suspected by the Dr on this account. As to this head, he stands or falls, with the rest of his Countrymen: and I doubt not but the Reader, upon a fair and impartial View of what has been said to This Article of Dr *Bentley's* Indictment against *Phalaris*, will pronounce him *Not Guilty*.

(*a*) Talentum sine adjectione Scriptoribus antiquis passim pro Attico. *Gronov.* de Pec. Vet. *c.* 3.

Talentum Atticum pro priè τάλαντον in scriptis Græcis Latinisque. *Bernard.* in Ep. ad Pocock.

Semper in Auctoribus (præter Sacros) ubi Nomen *Talenti* occurrit, hoc ipsum (*Atticum*, 6000 Drachmarum *Atticarum*) intelligendum est, si Nomen Talenti absolutè positum sit, nec distinctionis causâ aliquid adjiciatur.

Brerewood de Num. *p.* 27.

H I-

HItherto Dr *Bentley* has kept himself pretty well within his Province, and criticis'd chiefly upon Words, and Phrases, and Dialects; in his *next General Proof* he ventures to criticise upon *Things*, and to shew the Letters an Imposture, from the *Matter and Business* of 'em *. *They are a Fardle of Common Place*, (he says) *without any Life or Spirit from Action and Circumstance: When You come to 'em*, YOU FIND BY THE EMPTINESS AND DEADNESS OF THEM, THAT YOU CONVERSE WITH A DREAMING PEDANT, WITH HIS ELBOW ON HIS DESK; *not with an active ambitious Tyrant, with his Hand on his Sword*, &c. *All that takes or affects You is a Stiffness, and Stateliness, and Operoseness of Style*, &c. *which is quite alien from the Character of* Phalaris, *a Man of Business and Dispatch* †.

* Dissert. p. 55.

† Dissert. p. 62, 63.

Stiffness, and Stateliness, and Operoseness of Style, is indeed *quite alien from the Character of a Man of Business and Dispatch*: for which reason, any body that reads Dr *Bentley* would easily guess, that he is not *a Man of business*. And not being a Man of Business, but a *Library-keeper*, it is not overmodestly done of him, to oppose his Judgment and Taste in this case to that of Sir *William Temple*; who is certainly a Man of Business, and knows more of these things, than Dr *Bentley* does of *Hesychius* and *Suidas*. For, as his Friend Mr *Wotton* has with Great Sagacity observ'd, *It is Universally acknowledg'd, that he who has studied any Subject is a better Judge of that Subject*,

ject, than another Man who did never purpose bend his Thoughts that way; provided they be both Men of Equal Parts. Sir *William Temple* has spent a good part of his Life in transacting Affairs of State; He has written to Kings and They to Him: and this has qualified him to judge how Kings should write, much better than all Dr *Bentley*'s Correspondence with *Forreign Professors*; especially if they be such Professors, as have the Judgment to admire Him, and His *Humanity*. I shall not therefore offer a Word on the General Part of this Head, in Justification of the Epistles: I shall barely set down the Passage in which Sir *William Temple* expresses his Sense of this matter; and shall then leave it to the Reader, whose Opinion he'll think fit to take, either *His*, or the *Library-keeper*'s at St *James*'s. Sir *William*'s admirable Words are, *I think he must have but little skill in Painting, that cannot find out this to be an Original. Such Diversity of Passions upon such Variety of Actions, and Passages of Life and Government; such freedom of Thought, such Boldness of Expression; such Bounty to his Friends, such Scorn of his Enemies; such Honour of Learned Men, such Esteem of Good; such Knowledge of Life, such Contempt of Death, with such Fierceness of Nature, and Cruelty of Revenge could never be represented but by Him that possess'd 'em. And I esteem* Lucian *to have been no more capable of Writing than of Acting as* Phalaris *did. In all One writ You find the Scholar, or the Sophist; and in all the other writ, the Tyrant, and the Commander.* It is plain, Sir *William Temple* does not write *like a Dreaming Pedant, with his Elbow on his Desk*; and there-

*Reflect. upon ancient and modern Learning, p. 20.

therefore the Reader perhaps will be apt to take his Judgment, when he tells him, that *Phalaris* does not write like one neither.

I cannot but obſerve, that Dr *Bentley* is here and elſewhere (*a*) very Liberal in diſtributing the Reproach of *Pedantry*; which is to Me, I confeſs, a plain Proof that he has no juſt Notions of it: for if he had, it is ſo high an Offence againſt Good Manners, and Good Senſe, that methinks he ſhould impute it more ſparingly. I will endeavour therefore to ſet him right; which perhaps I ſhall be the better able to do, becauſe having convers'd much a late with ſome Writings, where this Beauty of Style prevails, I have very ſtrong and ſenſible Impreſſions of it.

(*a*) *Thoſe Little* Pedants, *that have ſtalkt about in the Apparel of Heroes.* Diſſ. p. 29. —— *that wretched* Pedantry *in the matter*, p. 65. —— *affected to excel each other, even to* Pedantry. P. 41, &c.

PEDANTRY is a Word of a very various and mix'd meaning, and therefore hard to be Defin'd: but I will Deſcribe it to the Dr as well as I can, by pointing out ſome of the Chief *Marks and Moles* of it.

The Firſt and ſureſt Mark of a *Pedant* is, to write without obſerving the receiv'd Rules of Civility, and Common Decency: and without diſtinguiſhing the Characters of Thoſe he writes to, or againſt: For Pedantry in the Pen, is what Clowniſhneſs is in Converſation; it is *Written Ilibreeding*.

It is *Pedantry*, to affect the uſe of an Hard Word, where there is an Eaſie one; or of a Greek or Latin Word, where there is an Engliſh one, that ſignifies the very ſame thing. And theſe Two Meanings of the Word

my

my Lord *Roscommon* seems to have hinted in those fine Verses of his; which are worth at least half a dozen Pages of Dr *Bentley's Scrap* of *Callimachus*, Notes and all.

The Soil intended for Pierian *Seeds*
Must be well purg'd from rank Pedantic *Weeds.*
Apollo *starts, and all* Parnassus *shakes*
At the rude Rumbling Baralipton *makes.*
For none were e'er with Admiration read,
But Who, beside their Learning, were well bred.
Essay on Transl. Vers.

How Dr *Bentley* will, on these Articles, excuse his Familiar Treatment of Sir *William Temple* (*a*), and his Course Compliments to Me (*b*); how he will bring off his Greek and Latin Proverbs (*c*), his *aliene*, and *negoce*, and *concede*, and *repudiating a Vernacular Idiom*, with an Hundred other such Elegances of Speech, I leave him to consider at his Leisure.

(*a*) *Could neither discover the true Time, nor true Value of his Authors.* p. 6. — *Criticism of a* Peculiar Complexion, *and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.* P. 7.

(*b*) Sorry Critic, Bungling Tinker, *Lucian's* Ass, &c.

(*c*) πολλὰ κανὰ τὸ πολέμου, Asinus ad Lyram, &c.

To over-rate the Price of Knowledge, and to make as great ado about the true Rendring of a Phrase, or Accenting of a Word, as if an Article of Faith, or the Fortune of a Kingdom depended upon it, is *Pedantry*. And so is an Assuming and Positive way of delivering ones self, upon Points especially not worth our Concern, and not capable of being perfectly clear'd. Aud whether Dr *Bentley* be guilty in this respect or no, the Reader will be

be able to judge, when he has cast his Eye on the Margin, and consider'd, how many times the Dr in his Dissertation, has freely us'd the Word *Demonstrate* of his own Performances (*a*): and withal, how fond he is of *Negatives*, (a very dangerous way of Speech!) and that in Cases oftentimes where the Contrary Affirmative is most certainly true; as it is, and shall be prov'd to be, in all those Instances, which this Mark † referrs to.

(*a*) — *even* Demonstrated, *that the Epistles of* Phal. *are Spurious.* P. 5.

— *that* Demonstrate Anaxilaus *to have liv'd* — P. 26.
— Demonstrate *the Doric Dialect to have been*, &c. P. 42.
— *But which is plain* Demonstration, P. 48.
— *I'll* Demonstrate *'em by and by to be an Imposture.* P. 116.
— *I shall* Demonstrate *ours to be of a modern date.* P. 138.
— *is a* Demonstrative *Proof.* P. 141.
† *There was* no such thing as Tragedy *while he tyranniz'd at* Agrigentum. P. 40.
προδεδωκότα never *us'd by the Ancients in that sense.* P. 52.
By that time I have done with 'em, it will be no more *a Controversie, whether they are Spurious.* P. 89.
There is No MS *above CCC Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy.* P. 146.
In all that Tract of Time, not one Single *Author, that has given us the* Least Hint *that* Æsop *was* Ugly. P. 149.
Astypalæa, *a City in* Crete, never *mention'd by any Geographer.* P. 44.
A Discovery in Geography, that could not *be learnt any where else.* P. 58.
Eustathius, *who* appears never *to have seen the true* Athenæus. P. 20.

To depart from the Common Ways of Writing or Speaking, and such as have been us'd by the best Pens, on purpose to shew ones self more Exact and Knowing than the Rest of the World, is a Piece of Affectation, that savours of *Pedantry*. *Tauromenium* is the word that is generally us'd by both Ancient and

and Modern Writers. Dr *Bentley* has reform'd our Spelling, and will have it *Tarentinum*; because *Pliny*, and *Solinus*, (and perhaps somebody else) have happen'd to call it so. And here I must beg the Reader's Excuse, if I go a little out of the Way, to do right to Sir *William Temple*, in a Case of the like nature: Mr *Wotton* tells him, with great Plainness of Speech, that *He, of all men, ought not to have arraign'd the Modern Ignorance in Grammar, who puts* Delphos *for* Delphi, *every where in his Essays* *: A Capital Mistake, and worthy to be chastis'd by the Acute Pen of Mr *Wotton*! But is he sure that putting *Delphos* for *Delphi* is an Offence against Grammar? I thought always, that what was according to Propriety, and the receiv'd Use of a Tongue, could not be against Grammar. It may indeed be against some General Rule of Grammar: but so Wise a Man as Mr *Wotton* is, should have known, that Grammar has not only *General Rules*, but *Particular Exceptions* too; and that the Common Custom and Usage of a Tongue is capable of creating an Exception at any time; and is as good a Rule as any in the Grammar. Now *Delphos*, for the Latin word *Delphi*, is us'd by all the finest Writers of our Tongue, and best Judges of it: particularly, by Mr *Waller* twice, in some (*a*) of his Last Copies; which, tho' they are worse Poetry than the rest, yet are in Correcter English: by Mr *Dryden*, four or five times, in his Life of *Plutarch* (*b*); by Mr *Duke* (*c*), and Mr *Creech* (*d*) often in their several Lives of *Theseus*, and *Solon*: and (be-

* Reflect. upon anc. and mod. Learning, *p.* 59.

(*a*) P. 269, 263.

(*b*) P. 6, 33, 41, 46, 48.
(*c*) P. 4, 20, 23, 36, 42, 59.
(*d*) P. 280, 288, 310.

(becauſe perhaps One Old Divine may weigh more with Mr *Wotton* than all theſe Modern Witneſſes) by the Reverend and Learned Dr *Jackſon*, in his Volumes on the Creed (*a*). Mr *Wotton* might have ſaid indeed, that *Delphos*, in the Singular Number, is not Good *Latin*, or Good *Greek*: but when he ſays, 'tis *bad Engliſh*, he only ſhews, that he does not converſe with ſo Good Authors as he ought to do. This Digreſſion might have been ſpar'd, but that Mr *Wotton*, when he was purging his Book of ſome unbecoming Paſſages in the ſecond Edition of it, thought fit ſtill to retain this Grammatical Reflection there: perhaps in a third Edition, he'll take care that This too ſhall bear the reſt Company.

(*a*) T. 2. P. 364.

Dr *Bentley* will forgive me this ſhort Viſit to his *Friend*, now I return to him.

Pedantry conſiſts alſo in *Low* and *Mean* ways of Speech, which are a Vicious Affectation of what is Natural and Eaſie, as Hard Words are of Learning and Scholarſhip. And whether Dr *Bentley* has not offended this way, by thoſe Familiar Expreſſions of *Mother Clito the Herbwoman*, and *Going to Pott*, and *ſetting Horſes together*, and *Roaſting the Old Woman*, and by his apt Simily drawn from *Bungling Tinkers mending old Kettles*; any-body, but Pedants, can tell.

An Itch of contradicting Great Men, or Eſtabliſh'd Opinions upon very ſlight Grounds, is another Inſtance of *Pedantry*: and (not to mention any thing that relates to the Preſent Diſpute) ſomething of this kind there was, I'm afraid, in Dr *Bentley*'s brisk Cenſure of

Grotius and *Scaliger* for not knowing the meaſure of an *Anapæſtic* Verſe (*a*), when 'tis plain (as I ſhall ſhew, before I lay down my Pen (*b*), that the Dr would never have cenſur'd 'em, if he had known it himſelf (*c*). *Caſtelvetro*, an Italian Pedant was famous for ſuch a Snarling Faculty as this; *He was* (as *Balzac* ſays very well of him (*d*) *a Public Enemy, that could not endure any-body ſhould have Merit, or Reputation, but himſelf.*

(*a*) *Bentl. Ep. ad Millium in fine Malalæ, p.* 26.

(*b*) *In the Article of the* Thericlean *Cups.*

(*c*) Modeſtè & circumſpectè de tantis Viris pronuntiandum eſt, ne fortè (quod pleriſque accidit) damnent quæ non intelligunt. *Quint.*

(*d*) Ceſtoit une Enemie Public, qui ne pouvoit ſoufrir le merite, ni la reputation de perſonne. *L.* 5, *Lettr.* 5.

The Subject is fruitful; but I will confine my ſelf to one Particular more of the *Pedant's* Character; and that is, a Love of Quoting Books or Paſſages not extant, or never ſeen by him, in order to amaze and confound his poor Reader, and make himſelf Terrible in the way of Learning. *As* Ariſtotle *ſays in his loſt Treatiſe of the* Sicilian *Government*, ſays the Dr *; tho' that Treatiſe be ſo far loſt, that *Ariſtotle* did really never write it. And again he tells us, what Monſieur *de Meziriac* (*e*) has done in his Life of *Æſop* (*e*), and yet owns in the very next Line, that he *never* met with this Book, but only *gueſs'd* what was in it. He (*f*) produces (*f*) *the Unknown Authors* Diodorus (*g*) *and* Lucian (*g*) *tranſcrib'd*, as ſo many Witneſſes on his ſide: and, in another place (*h*) he gives a very particular account of what *A. Gellius* ſaid in a *Loſt Chapter*; not from any other Writer that had quoted it, but meerly by dint of Conjecture.

* Differ. *p.* 55.

(*e*) P. 135.

(*f*) P. 26.

(*g*) P. 62.

(*h*) P. 28.

Theſe

Theſe are all the *Marks and Moles of Pedantry* that I can now ſtay to point out to the Dr: if he be ſtill at a loſs to know what the Pedants Character is, and where to apply it; I referr him to a Paſſage in *Bruyere* (*a*), where I think this matter is very ſuccinctly and fully handl'd. *There are* ſays he, *in Learning, as in War, a ſort of Inferiour and Subaltern Officers; Men, who ſeem made only for Regiſters and Magazines to ſtore up the Productions of better Writers. Collectors they are, Tranſcribers, Plagiaries; They never think themſelves; they tell You only what Others have thought before them. They heap together Matter in abundance, without Choice or Diſtinction; and care not how Worthleſs it is, ſo there be but Enough on't. They Know nothing, but juſt as they learn it from their Books; and Learn nothing but what every-body elſe deſires to be Ignorant of. They have a Vain, Dry, Inſipid ſort of Knowledge; that is Diſagreeable, and Uſeleſs; can neither enliven Converſation, nor conduce to Buſineſs. We are ſometimes ſurpriz'd at their Reading, but always tir'd with their Diſcourſe, or their Writings. Theſe are They, who among All the Little Men, and Some Great Ones, go for Scholars; but among the Wiſe and Senſible part of Mankind, for* Pedants.

(*a*) Les Charact. ou les Mœeurs de ce Siecle. Chap. des Ouvrages de l' Eſprit.

This Account of *Pedantry* has drawn me a little out of my Way; I ſhall now return again into it, and conſider the Particular Inſtances Dr *Bentley* has brought to juſtifie his General Aſſertion, that the *Matter and Buſineſs* of the Letters betrays 'em not to be Genuine.

*P. 56. The first is *an Improbable and Absurd Story* (as he thinks) about *Stesichorus*; who dying at *Catana*, the *Himereans* desir'd to have his Ashes brought back into his Native City *Himera*; but the *Catanæans* would not part with them. This occasion'd a fierce Contest between the two Towns, which *Phalaris* appeas'd, by prevailing with the *Himereans* to let *Stesichorus*'s Ashes sleep in Peace at *Catana*, and build a Temple to the Honour of him, at Home. Now what is there in this Story either *Absurd*, or *Improbable*? that the *Himereans* should be so concern'd to get the Ashes of *Stesichorus*, and the *Catanæans* to keep them? This very thing happen'd afterwards in the case of *Euripides*; whose Bones the *Athenians* sent a solemn Embassy to *Macedonia*, to retrieve, as *A. Gellius* informs us (*a*); and that, not in *a Lost Chapter*. And after the Denial of this Request, we learn from *Pausanias* (*b*, that the *Athenians* built a Noble Monument to the Memory of *Euripides*, which continu'd even to his Time. Somewhat of the same Honour was paid to *Hesiod*'s Remains; which being buried, where *Hesiod* was murder'd, a great way off *Ascra*, the *Orchomenians*, *Plutarch* tells us (*c*) by the Advice of the Oracle, endeavour'd all they could to get 'em into their possession, but They that had 'em, would not be prevail'd upon to part with 'em. And if *Euripides* and *Hesiod* were honour'd with such Contentions as these, after their Deaths, why might not *Stesichorus*?

(*a*) L. 15. C. 20.

(*b*) L. 1, P. 2.

(*c*) Conv. Sap. *p.* 162

Ay, but says the Dr, *a Temple, and Deification, were a little too Extravagant an Honour to be paid to a Poet's Memory* (*d*). I thought such things as these could not have surpriz'd a

(*d*) Differ. *p.* 57.

man

man of the Dr's *Polymathy:* but, I find, he knows nothing of the ſeveral *Temples* erected to *Homer* at *Smyrna*, and in other places; as *Strabo* (a), and *Ælian* (b) expreſly affirm; not ſo much as remembers that Known Paſſage in *Tully*'s Oration *pro Archiâ Poetâ*, which is no Secret even to the Firſt Beginners in Learning. Homer (ſays he) *the* Smyrnæans *claim as a Native of theirs; and* therefore *they have erected a Temple to him.* From whence alſo Dr *Bentley* may pleaſe to learn the reaſon why *Phalaris* would have the *Himereans* content themſelves with erecting a Temple to *Steſichorus*, becauſe That would declare to Poſterity, that he was Born there (c).

Homerum Smyrnæi ſuum eſſe confirmant: itaque etiam Delubra Ejus in Oppido collocaverunt.

(a) *Smyrna Homerum Vatem ſibi oſtentans.*

vendicabat; Sepulcrum, *Templum*, & Statuas ipſius *Varro.*

Nay, it happens a little unluckly, that an Ancient *Marble* is preſerv'd to this Day, (which perhaps belong'd to ſome Temple erected to the Honour of *Homer*, in ſome of the places that contended for his Birth) where the *Apotheoſis*, or Deification of that Poet is deſcrib'd; and a Learned Man, *Cuperus*, has writ a Large Comment upon it: which methinks the Dr ſhould have been acquainted with, tho' he be not *a Foreign Profeſſor.*

E're I quit this Particular, I muſt obſerve a Little Slip of the Dr's, in telling us, that *Himera* in *Tully*'s time was call'd *Therma* *. I believe it was not; becauſe *Tully* himſelf aſſures us, that *Himera* and *Therma* were two Different Towns; and the Latter built at ſome Diſtance from the Ruines of the For-

* Differt. p. 57.

mer (*a*). And, without this Diſtinction between *Himera* and *Thermæ* 'tis impoſſible to underſtand *Diodorus*, where he ſays, that after *Himera* was ſack'd and ras'd by the *Carthaginians*, it contínu'd altogether uninhabited, even to His Days (*b*): which could not be True, if *Himera* and *Thermæ* were the ſame; for, that *Thermæ* was well inhabited in *Diodorus*'s time, is paſt Diſpute. I will not deny, but that ſome careleſs Paſſages may perhaps have dropp'd from the Pens of Old Authors, where theſe Two are not nicely diſtinguiſh'd: but it is not in Works, where they ſet up for being ſevere upon other Mens Miſtakes; and Their want of Exactneſs therefore may be forgiven them. But Dr *Bentley*, who profeſſes to give no Quarter, ſhould take care not to want any.

(*a*) Himerâ deletâ, quos Cives belli Callimitas reliquos fecerat, ii ſeſe *Thermis* collocarant, in ejuſdem agri finibus, nec longè ab Oppido antiquo. *Or.* 7. *in Verr.*

(*b*) Τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίων χειρωθείσης, καὶ παντελῶς ἐρημωθείσης, μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καιρῶν. L. 11, p. 38.

His Laſt Objection happily aroſe from contemplating the Matter of One Single Epiſtle; the Dr will now compare the Epiſtles together, and confute One by another. There is an *Inconſiſtency*, he ſays, *between the* LIſt *and the* LXIXth, *becauſe in the* LIſt Phalaris's *Wife is Dead, and in the* LXIXth, *She is Alive again* *. As if it were neceſſary that theſe Epiſtles ſhould have been written juſt in the ſame Order that they ſtand; which is different in the Printed Copies from what it is in the MSS, and different in one MS from what

* P. 57.

what is in another. Upon ſuch an unreaſonable Suppoſition as this, how many *Inconſiſtencies* might be found in *Tully*'s Epiſtles? or even in Thoſe of St *Paul*? And yet, if this Suppoſition do not take place, there is no manner of *Inconſiſtency* between thoſe Two Epiſtles of *Phalaris*. The Penetrating Dr *Bentley* ſeems to have had ſome Suſpicions, that this Argument was of it ſelf a little too weak to ſtand its Ground; and therefore has back'd it with a ſtrong Reſerve of Four Other Suppoſitions: and if All Theſe hold good, he will ſtill prove the Epiſtles Spurious. Firſt he *ſuppoſes*, that *Erythia* was poiſon'd by *Python*, *not long after* Phalaris's *Baniſhment*; becauſe otherwiſe, *he ſuppoſes*, ſhe *could not want Opportunities to follow him*: then he *ſuppoſes*, Erythia *was poiſon'd in the Iſland* Aſtypalæa, where he *ſuppoſes*, that *her Priſoner dwelt*. Here are more *Poſtulatums* than *Euclid* requir'd to build the Whole Body of his Elements upon; and yet He muſt be very kind to Dr *Bentley*, that will grant him any One of them; ſince there is nothing either in the Epiſtles themſelves, or in any Other Hiſtory I have had the Luck to meet with, that can give 'em the leaſt Countenance. At preſent therefore I take the ſame Liberty to deny every one of theſe Suppoſitions, as He has taken to aſſume them: If hereafter he can prove them in another Language, 'twill then be time enough to ſhew, that they are *Nothing to the Purpoſe*.

In ſome Other Epiſtles, the Dr has diſcover'd a *Scene of Putid and Senſleſs Formality* *. A Man of Quality in *Syracuſe*, whoſe Wife

* Diſſert. p. 58.

was lately Dead, ſends his Brother to *Phalaris*, with a Requeſt, that he would endeavour to prevail with *Steſichorus* to write an Elegy upon Her; *Phalaris* trys, and prevails: but is not ſo ſucceſsful in a ſecond Attempt of the ſame Nature, that he makes at the inſtance of another *Sicilian* Gentleman. I proteſt, I can ſee no Harm in all this: there may indeed, for ought I know, be *Puriſh Formality* in it, becauſe I can't well tell what thoſe Hard Words mean; but I ſee nothing Unnatural there, or Misbecoming the Character of *Phalaris*. No! ſays the Dr, what? *can any One believe that ſuch Stuff as this buſied the Head of the Tyrant* *? As Low thoughts as the Dr has of the *Epiſtles*, I find he has very high ones of *Phalaris*: he ſeems to have repreſented him to himſelf, as ſome Mighty Monarch that had Vaſt Dominions, and was too Great, and too Buſie, to attend ſuch Trifles: whereas He was only a Petty Prince of One Town in *Sicily*; and, as ſuch, I hope, the Office here given him was no ways below him. Indeed the Dr has, for the Honour of *Phalaris*, repreſented that Town as exceeding *Populous*; for *Diodorus*, he ſays, counts 200000 Souls in *Agrigent*, and Others 800000 †. *Diodorus* I grant, in the place cited, ſays, there were ſuch Numbers in it, when the *Carthaginians* took it, *Olymp.* LXXXXIII. 3; when (as he tells us in the ſame place) it was in its moſt proſperous and flouriſhing Eſtate: but muſt there needs be as many Inhabitants in it, 150 Years before, in the Reign of *Phalaris*? As for his Other Witneſs *Laertius*, his 800000 are given up by the

* Diſſert. p. 59.

† Diſſert. p. 58.

the Learned, as a Gross Mistake; which *Bochart* supposes to have risen from the change of a Numeral K into a Π: or, however that may be, the Account, he says, *is incredible, and utterly false* *. Incredible as it is, the Dr vouchsafes to take up with it; and it grows under his Hands: for by that time we are got to the End of this Article, these 800000 are *a Million of Subjects* †: the 200000 are thrown in carelessly to make it a Round Number. Let it be a *Million*; yet there have been Tyrants, with *many Millions* of Subjects at their Command, who have thought fit to employ and entertain themselves much after this manner. Has the Dr, who deals so much in *Fragments*, never seen those of *Augustus*'s Letters to *Horace*? has he never heard, that we owe the *Fourth Book of* Horace's *Odes*, and the finest of all his *Epistles*, to that Prince's Importunity; who press'd, and oblig'd him to write, and to make mention of *Him* in his Poems? And *such Stuff*, I presume, may very well be allow'd to busie *Phalaris*'s *Head*, which found room in the Thoughts of *Augustus*.

* *Cùm res planè superat fidem, atque sit falsissima.* Phaleg. *p.* 553.

† Disser. *p.* 58.

But why so much ado? says Our Keen Observer; could not the *Syracusian have written to* Stesichorus, *and at the price of some Present met with Success* *? I agree with the Dr that *a Present* is sometimes an Expeditious Method of doing Business; I have known several things in my Life-time *stick* for want of it. However here it was Improper: for *Stesichorus* was not only the Greatest Poet, but one of the Greatest Men in *Sicily*. His Brother

* Dissert. *p.* 60.

ther *Helianax* was a Law-giver [*Νομοθέτης*] *Suidas* tells us; and He himſelf probably in the Government of *Himera*; or at leaſt conſulted by 'em in Extraordinary Caſes, as appears by his Apologue in *Ariſtotle*'s Rhetoric. And the true way of prevailing with ſuch a man to employ his excellent Pen was to offer him not Mony, but a Subject that deſerv'd it. Some of his Brother Poets indeed were to be tempted this way: but they were Men of Mean Birth, and Education; and were to make their Fortunes by their Pen; and no wonder therefore that they were Mercenary.

It is objected, that if theſe Letters about the *Elegy* were *Phalaris*'s, he would have expreſs'd himſelf properly, and not have *call'd the ſame Copy of Verſes* μέλος, *and* ἐλεγεῖον, *which are as different from one another as* Theognis *from* Pindar (*a*): *an Egregious Piece of Dulneſs*, ſays the Dr, and which proves him to be *a meer Aſinus ad Lyram!* Now, to ſee the different Caſt of Mens Heads, allowing the Error in this caſe, ſo *Egregiouſly Dull* am I, that I ſhould have reaſon'd juſt the other way from it; that if *a Sophiſt* had writ theſe Letters, he would never have confounded theſe Two Words, the diſtinct Senſe of which was ſo well ſettl'd before his Time by the Grammarians. But in *Phalaris*'s time the meaning of theſe Terms of Art might not be ſo ſtrictly mark'd out; or *a Prince* might not think himſelf oblig'd to take notice of it, and to write with all the Exactneſs of a Scholar. So that from this very Miſtake, if it were one, I ſhould have inferr'd ſomething

(*a*) Diſſer. 2. 59.

in

in favor of the Letters: but, to our Misfortune, here is no Mistake. *Phalaris* did but as a Nicer Man than He might have done; he calls the Poem Ἐλεγεῖον (*a*), when he asks it of *Stesichorus*, and did not know in what Verse it would be compos'd by him; and he calls it μέλος afterwards (*b*), when he had it, and found it was in Lyric Measures.

(*a*) Ep. 144.

(*b*) Ep. 79.

Ἔλεγος and Ἐλεγεῖον originally signified only a Mournful or Funeral Song (*c*); an *Elegy*, as we say in *English*: referring to the Subject of the Song, and not to the Measure. But *Elegies* being generally writ in *Hexameters* and *Pentameters*, the Word came afterwards to be apply'd purely to the *Measure*, without any Regard to the *Subject*. However, this Second Sense of the Word did not so far prevail, as absolutely to extinguish the First; still Ἔλεγος and Ἐλεγεῖον were now and then employ'd in a Looser Meaning than what the Grammarians put upon 'em; and of this I will give the Dr one plain Instance, from a Darling Author of his, *Dion Chrysostome*, who in his 4th Book *de Regno* calls the *Heroic Verses* written on *Sardanapalus*'s Tomb, Ἐλεγεῖον: And *Aristophanes* speaking of the *Nightingale*, has this Passage:

(*c*) —*Elegeïa, flebile Carmen:*
Ah! nimis ex vero nunc tibi nomen habes!
Ovid.

Καὶ οἱ Ἑλληνικοὶ δὲ ἔλεγοι, ὃ ἐστι θρῆνοι, οἱ μετ' αὐλοῦ, φασὶν, ἤδοντο· πένθιμος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πρῶτόν, φασὶν, ὁ αὐλός· Eust. in Hom. Il. Ω. paulò ante finem.

Φοῖβος ἀκούων τοῖς σοῖς ἐλέγοις
Ἀντιψάλλει· In Ὄρνιθ.

Where ἐλέγοις can signifie nothing, but a *Melancholy*

lancholy Tune, or *Mournful Song* (a); unless our Grammarian can prove, that the Nightingales in that part of the World sung in Elegiac Measure. And the Misfortune of it is, that these very Ἔλεγοι are called μέλη but a few Verses before.

(a) Accordingly the *Scholiast* thus interprets it. Τοῖς σᾶς ἐλέγοις, ἀντὶ τῶν τοῖς θρήνοις· Εἴρηται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀ ὐ λέγειν

Τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ σὸν πολύδακρυν Ἴτυν
Ἐλελιζομένη διεροῖς μέλεσι·

And I hope *Aristophanes* understood Greek, and was no *Asinus ad Lyram*. As strong Proofs as these may seem, I have still behind One Authority more, which will go farther with Dr *Bentley* than any I have yet brought: 'tis his Own. He, *p.* 139, of his Dissertation, tells us, that Some-body made an *Edition of Æsop's Fables in Elegiac Verse*; and, after giving us several Instances of the kind, he adds, that *Some of them* (*i. e.* of the Elegiac Fables) were *all in Hexameters* (*b*). I'd advise him therefore to call in this Criticism, and his Dirty Proverb along with it, for fear it shou'd stick where has not a mind it should.

(*b*) Disser. *p.* 140.

He has still One way left of disproving this *Piece of Putid Formality*; and that is, by denying that *Stesichorus* and *Phalaris* were acquainted (*c*). 'Tis a Negative, and therefore pretty hard to be made out; let us see how he sets about it. He observes, that *Lucian* says nothing of this Acquaintance. *Lucian* mentions it not by Name indeed; but he speaks in General of *Phalaris*'s Conversation with Learned Men, and their great Esteem of him;

(*c*) Ibid. *p.* 60.

him; and then gives an Instance in *Pythagoras*, the most celebrated Scholar of his Time (a): and after Him, there needed no other Instances. Had a Less Skilful Hand been employ'd in making this Oration, he would probably have heap'd up all he knew of *Phalaris*, and overacted his part by too Great and Circumstantial a Nicety. But *Lucian* had more Art; he knew when to leave off, that the Piece might not look stiff and unnatural. Besides, if *Lucian*'s Silence be an Exception to *Stesichorus*'s acquaintance with *Phalaris*, it is to *Abaris*'s too; which yet Our Critic has before, for the sake of *Aristotle* and *Jamblichus* *, been graciously pleas'd to allow.

(a) Ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ ἐξετάσεσθαι φοιτῶσι παρ' ἐμὲ οἱ συφώτατοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ ἡ φεύγουσι τὴν παρουσίαν ἐκείνου· ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ πρώτην ὃ Σοφὸς Πυθαγόρας ἧκεν ὡς ἡμᾶς, &c.

Luc. Phal. 1.

But *Plato* is silent, as well as *Lucian*, in this matter; and that in an Epistle written to a Tyrant of *Sicily*, where he *is reckoning up the Friendships of Learned Men with Tyrants and Magistrates* †. Neither has *Plato mention'd* any thing in that Epistle of the acquaintance between *Phalaris* and *Pythagoras*; which had been as Proper, and as *Domestic* an Instance as the other. And yet the *Pythagoreans* all agree that their Master and *Phalaris* were acquainted; and Dr *Bentley* grants it: why should *Plato*'s Ill Memory be a proof against the one, and no Proof against the other? But I rather think, it was his Good Judgment, than his Ill Memory, that occasion'd this Omission: *Phalaris*'s Name was detested and infamous in *Sicily*; and to have brought him in therefore among his other Instances, would have

* Differ. p. 15.

† Ibid. p. 61.

have ſpoil'd the Complement to *Dionyſius*, who might like well enough to have the Parallel drawn between Him and *Hiero*, or *Pericles*, or *Periander*, or *Cræſus*; but would not have thought it a Civility, I believe, to have been compar'd with *Phalaris*: whoſe Character, when taken at the beſt, and as drawn in theſe Epiſtles, is not ſo Amiable, as that any man ſhould be pleas'd with reſembling him; eſpecially One, who could not but be conſcious to himſelf, that he had made uſe of His Methods, and had reaſon to expect His Fate. *Plato* was a Great Maſter of Decency; and he never ſhew'd it more than in this dextrous management; which I am not ſurpriz'd to find that our Library-keeper has no Reliſh of.

His laſt Argument is from *Pindar*, who ſpeaks of *Phalaris*'s Cruelty with Deteſtation. And what follows from thence? that he never heard of *his Extraordinary Dearneſs with Steſichorus*; for the *ſake* of which, *Pindar*, had he known it, would certainly have *forborn giving him ſo Vile a Character* (*a*). This indeed is Demonſtration, and not to be withſtood! I will not Attempt to anſwer it; only I will put the Dr in mind of One falſe Colour, that he has given to his Argument: for it does not appear from any Expreſſion in this Ode, that *Pindar* is there *exhorting* Hiero *to be kind to Poets and Men of Letters* (*b*). There is not a Word of being kind to *Poets and Men of Letters* mention'd in the Verſes themſelves, whatever Gueſs his Commentators (who perhaps knew as little of *Pindar*'s Intentions, as I or Dr *Bentley* do) may make at their Remote

(*a*) Differ. p. 61.

(*b*) Ibid.

Mean-

Meaning. *Pindar* only praises *Hiero* for his *Humanity* and *Hospitality*, at large; and tells him, *Crœsus* was renown'd for these Vortues, and *Phalaris* infamous for the want of 'em. Which I would have observ'd; because if he be not speaking here of *Beneficence to Poets and Men of Letters*, Dr *Bentley* might as well have undertaken to prove his point from ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, as from the passage he has produc'd. He has lam'd it in his Quotation; I will give it the Reader entire (*a*): Crœsus, says he, *will always be renown'd for his Humanity and Benevolence; but the Memory of the Savage and Inhuman* Phalaris *is every where detested.* Could a better Panegyric be made upon *Hiero*, in fewer Words? Could any thing be more artful, than the pitching upon these Two Opposite Instances, to set out his Character by? Were a Man to Complement some Person in Dr *Bentley*'s Station could he do it more effectually, than by saying of him, that he had all the Humanity and Good Nature of the Library-keeper at *Cambridge* *, and none of the Disobliging Rude Qualities of Him at St *James*'s?

(*a*) Ὀυ φθίνει Κρόισου φιλόφρων ἀρετὰ: τὸ δὲ Ταύρῳ χαλχέῳ καυτῆρα νηλέα νόον ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντῷ φάτις.

* Mr. *Laughton.*

After all, the Dr's Opinion and Mine upon this point are not so very distant as he may imagine: for I agree with him, that there was no *Extraordinary Dearness* between *Stesichorus* and *Phalaris*; nor do *the Letters* themselves imply that there was. They say indeed, that *Phalaris* oblig'd and courted *Stesichorus*, out of Vanity, or a Real Esteem of his Merit. And *Stesichorus* could not but pay some

ſome Regard to *Phalaris* on this account, tho' he could never Love Him, or his Character: nor is there any Proof from the Epiſtles, that he did. *Phalaris*, after he had given him his Life, deſir'd only his Friendſhip in return; and *Steſichorus* was oblig'd both in Gratitude and Prudence, not to ſtand off; but to be in as Good Terms as he could with a Man that was able to do him ſo much Miſchief. We have a Lively Account of juſt ſuch a management as this between *Julius Cæſar* and *Tully*, in the Epiſtles of the Latter. When *Cæſar* had got the better of *Pompey*, whoſe Side *Tully* took, either out of a true Eſteem for *Tully*'s Vertues, or out of Deſign, he took all Methods of making him hit Own; pay'd him a great many Civilities, and did him a great many Services. *Tully* could never from his Heart love a Tyrant: but we may imagine how he behav'd in this caſe; he accepted *Cæſar*'s proffer'd Friendſhip, wrote Civilly to him, and lay ſtill. No more than this, that I can ſee, ever paſs'd between *Steſichorus* and *Phalaris*, to ſpeak upon the Foot of the Letters: and if ſo, what becomes of Dr *Bentley*'s Harangue about the Silence of Authors, in relation to this fancied Intimacy and Dearneſs? Good Writers muſt needs ſay nothing of that which never happen'd. *Steſichorus*'s Love for *Phalaris* could no more be the Subject of any of the Pens that went before us, than Dr *Bentley*'s *Humanity* will be of any of the Pens that ſhall come after us. 'Tis Eaſie then to anſwer for the *Silence of Authors* upon This Head; whether it can be juſtified as well upon the Next, I ſhall now enquire.

IN my Preface to *Phalaris*, among the Objections that might be mis'd againſt th' Epiſtles, I mention'd This for One, that they had, for ought we knew, *lain a Thouſand Years without being taken notice of.* Dr *Bentley* has been pleas'd to reſume this ſlight Argument of mine, as he did that of the *Dialect*, and give it a place among his Irrefragable Demonſtrations; an Honour which, I muſt own, it no ways deſerves. For, tho' he has taken this occaſion of ſhewing his Extraordinary Talent in Wit and Raillery, and tells us, the Epiſtles were *preſerv'd in the Parchments of* Jove, *and buried in ſome Secret Cave under Ground*; *or elſe they had certainly gone to Pot* *: yet I ſuppoſe he does not in good Earneſt think it any great Wonder, that Mortal Vellum ſhould endure a Thouſand Years; or that a ſmall Parcel of Letters ſhould lye ſo many Ages without being mention'd by any Author now extant: a Thing not altogether Incredible, becauſe it has actually happen'd to other Books beſides *Phalaris*.

* Diſſert. p. 63.

Vellejus Paterculus, an Elegant Writer, and one that tells us ſeveral Particulars, not to be met with in other Roman Hiſtorians, might with more reaſon expect to be taken notice of than Our Author: yet perhaps Dr *Bentley* won't meet with any plain mention of his Writings for *Five Centuries* after he writ, till *Priſcian* quotes him, and that only in a point of Grammar. After this time he'll be as much at a loſs to find any Footſteps of him for *Nine Hundred Years* more, down to the Age of *Aventinus*: and yet the Criticks

have receiv'd him without being ſo nice as to examine, what *Secret Cave he was conceal'd in. Phædrus*, as far as I can find, was never mention'd by any Author ſince *Avienus*, till his Fables were in this Age brought to light by *Pithœus*, after they had been loſt *above a Thouſand Years. Lactantius de Mortibus Perſecutorum*, was a Book not ſpoken of by anybody ſince St *Jerome*, till, after *a Thouſand Years*, *Baluze* diſcover'd it in the famous Library of *Colbert*, and made it publick. Now, as our Diſſertator learnedly argues; if theſe Books lay *untouch'd and unſtirr'd*, they muſt have *moulder'd away*; if they were us'd during theſe Ten Centuries, *Somebody would ſurely have ſpoken of 'em.* Either the Dr muſt give up theſe Authors as Spurious, or theſe Objections as Slight and Frivolous; and own, that the *Silence* of the Ancients is not a *Direct*, but (as any-body elſe would have thought, and call'd it) a very *Indirect* Argument againſt 'em: tho' ſtill not quite ſo indirect as another, that he founds upon a Diſagreement between *Lucian*, and the *Epiſtles*, in their Accounts of *Phalaris*. This does not come properly under the head I am now ſpeaking to: however, becauſe he has thrown together here Two or Three Paultry Proofs, that would make no Figure by themſelves, I ſhall take 'em as they lye before me. The Different Relations concerning *Phalaris* given by *Lucian*, and the *Epiſtles*, I urg'd formerly * as a Proof that *Lucian* could not write them. But as He has manag'd it, at ſecond hand, to ſhew, that *Lucian does as good as expreſly declare*

* Preface to my Edition of *Phalaris*.

he

he never ſaw 'em, it either proves nothing, or proves too much; even that *Lucian* never ſaw *Timæus*, as Learned as he was, and as often as he mentions him. For *Timæus* relates, that the *Agrigentines* threw the *Brazen Bull* into the Sea; but *Lucian* ſays, *Phalaris* ſent it to *Delphos*. What I ſhould gather from hence would be, that *Lucian* overlook'd that and many other Authorities, and did not confine himſelf to ſtrict Hiſtory in a Declamation: but, according to Dr *Bentley*'s manner of drawing Conſequences it muſt follow, that *Timæus* no more writ his Hiſtory, than *Phalaris* did his Letters; for *Lucian* equally contradicts Both; and for that reaſon is a Bad Evidence againſt either of them. Now if *Lucian* himſelf be of no Authority in this point, much leſs are *thoſe Authors he follow'd* *, which Dr *Bentley* ſummons up as ſo many *Witneſſes againſt* the Epiſtles. I would ask him how *many* Witneſſes theſe are? where they liv'd? what are their Names, and the Names of the Books they wrote? 'Tis very hard to urge ſuch Teſtimonies againſt us, as are not now, and probably never were in being: For *Lucian*, in this Harangue, ſeems to tye himſelf up to no Authors, nor to be guided by any thing but his own Invention: and this the Dr himſelf confeſſes in another place †; where he ſays, Lucian *feigns an Embaſſy from* Phalaris *to* Delphi. And if the Ground of this whole Diſcourſe were a *Fiction*, why does the Dr here argue from it as ſeriouſly as if it were copy'd from the moſt Authentic Hiſtories then extant? how can he allow himſelf to put ſuch an Air of Gravity upon what he

* Differt. p. 65.

† Differt. p. 62.

knows to be a Trifle? We ſhall have him, at this rate, in his next Diſſertation, ſolemnly quoting *Lucian*'s *Vera Hiſtoria* too, and the unknown *Authors which he follow'd*: But I ſuppoſe he reſolv'd to make the beſt advantage he could of theſe Poor Colours, for want of Better Authorities: For the Two Hiſtorians he brings to ſtrengthen his Proof, ſay nothing that is inconſiſtent with the Epiſtles. Jamblichus, he ſays, *brings in* Abaris *in company with* Pythagoras *to* Phalaris; *but in the Epiſtles* Abaris *refuſes to come*. Who would not have refus'd an Invitation from *Phalaris*, till he had good aſſurances that he might come with Safety? Report had told him very diſmal Stories of the Tyrant, and dreſs'd him up in frightful Colours; *Abaris* perhaps did not know at firſt, but that *Phalaris* might Live upon Philoſophers Fleſh; or might have a Fancy to try, which made his Bull Roar beſt, a *Scythian*, or a *Sicilian*. Theſe were very Important matters, and if he ſhould not have taken care to be fully ſatisfied in 'em before he ventur'd his Perſon, he had not been quite ſo *Wiſe* a man as he was thought to be; for one part of Wiſdom is to be *Cautious*. *Pythagoras* therefore manag'd at the very ſame rate; he often refus'd to come (*a*), and yet came at laſt: why might not this be the caſe of *Abaris?* This is a very eaſie way of reconciling *Phalaris* with *Jamblichus*; and he does not differ ſo widely from *Heraclides* neither, but that They too may be brought (with Dr *Bentley*'s Leave, and in his *Carriers* Phraſe) *to ſet Horſes together*. *Phalaris* ſays, he was an *Orphan*, before he came to *Agrigent*; and

(*a*) Ep. LXXIV.

and yet *Heraclides* ſays, his Mother was burnt there. Dr *Bentley* has given a Clear Solution of this Difficulty himſelf; and frankly owns, that his *Mother* might be burnt, tho' his *Father* dy'd long before. *But how*, ſays he, *came the Old Woman to be roaſted at* Agrigent, *if* Phalaris *fled alone from* Aſtypalæa, *neither Wife nor Child, nor any Relation following him, according to the Epiſtles* (*a*)? I do not remember any ſuch Epiſtle in My Edition of *Phalaris*; but if there ſhould be ſuch an one in the King's MS, I'll anſwer this Objection to it, when the Library-keeper is in ſo good an Humor, as to favour me with a Sight of it: Till then, I may be excus'd from proſecuting this Point any further. Only I muſt obſerve to the Dr, that either he uſes ſome Copy of *Heraclides* that I have not ſeen; or elſe cites him for what he does not ſay. Both Here, and in the 30th Page of his Diſſertation, he tells us, from *Heraclides*, that *Phalaris* was *burnt* by the *Agrigentines*; whereas *Heraclides* only ſays, ὃν ὁ δῆμος ἐπυρώσατο. 'Tis true, it's all one to his purpoſe, whether he was burnt, or any other way put to Death: but he has ſuch a Facility of Miſunderſtanding or Miſrepreſenting Authors, to ſerve a Turn; that he does it, even when it is of no ſervice to him.

(*a*) Differ. p. 65.

I Hope I have now ſo thoroughly examin'd Dr *Bentley*'s *General Arguments*, that none of 'em can be thought to affect the whole *Body* of the Epiſtles: if his Objections againſt ſome *Particular* Letters have no more Weight in 'em, he's the beſt Patron *Phalaris* has yet met with; for the next Happineſs to being very well Defended, is that of being very weakly Oppos'd. All his Attacks of this kind are grounded upon *Chronology:* and therefore, before he could make any Approaches, he was oblig'd to ſettle the Time of *Phalaris*. And firſt he gives us the account of *Euſebius* thus. "Ol. XXXI. 2. *Phalaris apud* "*Agrigentinos Tyrannidem exercet.* Ol. XXXVII. "2. *Phalaridis Tyrannis deſtructa:* by which "reckoning he govern'd 28 Years *. Inſtead of *Ol.* XXXVII, he means, I ſuppoſe, *Ol.* XXXVIII, as 'tis in *Euſebius*; or elſe his Reckoning of 28 Years (which he could bring in here, for no other Reaſon, but to ſhew his Skill in Counting) is falſe. However, he is willing to allow, that (according to St *Hierome*, and *Suidas*) Phalaris's *Government commenc'd* Ol. LIII. 3. *and expir'd* Ol. LVII. 3. *This Account*, ſays he, *I allow of for the ſake of* Ariſtotle *and* Jamblichus, *who make him Cotemporary with* Steſichorus *and* Pythagoras †. But by his Niceneſs in Computation he confutes himſelf in the ſame Breath, and ſays, Pythagoras *was not taken notice of in* Greece *till* 80 *Years after* Ol. XXXVIII. 2. (for I'll ſuppoſe XXXVII a falſe Print) *i. e.* Three Years after

* *Diſſert.* p. 14.

† Ibid. p. 15.

ter *Phalaris* dy'd. And yet *Pythagoras* had a great Name in *Greece* many Years before he came into *Sicily*. So that Dr *Bentley* has manag'd this Point with a particular Dexterity; and prov'd that *Pythagoras* and *Phalaris* could not be acquainted, by that very account which he accepted of meerly to countenance their acquaintance. A moſt auſpicious Entrance upon his Chronological Proofs! doubtleſs all the reſt will be made out with Equal Force and Clearneſs! Here's a Page ſpent to give us his Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris*, where he has ſo contriv'd to ſay one thing, and prove another, that we are ſtill at a loſs to know what his Opinion is. If Dr *Bentley* be ſo Quarrelſome, that he cannot agree with himſelf, how is it poſſible for other people to agree with him? I would willingly allow of any Date of *Phalaris* that he is inclin'd to admit: but ſince he has expreſs'd himſelf ſo intricately, that 'tis hard to know which way he is determin'd, I'll take the moſt receiv'd Account; and go on to ſhew, that, notwithſtanding any of *His* Diſcoveries, the Epiſtles might have been written before the 58th Olympiad.

He begins his Chronological Obſervations with the *Æra's* of ſome Cities mention'd in the Epiſtles; a very Slippery Foundation to build an Argument upon! for all theſe Cities are ſo very ancient, that it would puzzle one of a Greater Reach in Chronology than Dr *Bentley*, to trace their Originals. The Oldeſt Hiſtorians now extant had but very Slender Memoirs of thoſe times; and

accordingly we find their Accounts so confus'd and contradictory, that No-body but a Man of Dr *Bentley*'s Judgment would pretend to draw Demonstrations from 'em. I hear the Famous Mr *Dodwell* (who surpasses Dr *Bentley* in Learning, as much as he does in Candour and Modesty) is now printing some Lectures at *Oxford*, in which he shews, how very obscure and uncertain the Histories of those Ages are; and that from the Concurrence of those Rude Accounts he meets with, he has made it probable that *Phalaris* must be brought much lower than even St *Hierome* places him. This perhaps would cut off most of the Dr's Arguments at One Blow: but for want of this assistance, I must encounter 'em singly; and be content to wander with him thro' those Woods and Mazes in which he often loses both Himself and his Reader. But before I follow him into this Dark Scene, I will consider a little the Tendency of this way of arguing in General. He would prove that *Phalaris* could not possibly be the Author of these Letters, because some Places are mention'd there under such Names, as he thinks were given 'em since the Age of *Phalaris*. Does he know Whose this Sort of Proof is, and to what Ill Purposes it has been employ'd? it is famous for being made use of by *Spinosa*, and others, to ruine the Authority of *Moses*'s Writings; which they would prove not to be His (just as our Chronologer here does) from Places being mention'd in 'em, more Modern than He. Ought the Dr in a Doubting Age to have employ'd such an Argument, without the

the utmost Caution and Guard? Ought he to have propos'd it so Generally and Crudely, without informing his Reader, how far it held, and where it fail'd? what Exceptions were necessary to be made to it, and of what Solutions it was capable? Is he so Eager to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, that he cares not whether the Authority of the Sacred Writings sink with him? But I hope he does n't think there's any more Weight in *Spinosa*'s, than I think there is in His Arguments. One of the Answers I have heard given upon this occasion is, that these Names were chang'd since *Moses* writ, to make his History more intelligible to those, to whom the ancient Names of those Towns and Countries were no longer known. And this Plea therefore I might fairly lay hold of for *Phalaris*, if there were any need of it; and presume, that the Copyers of these Letters might alter some of the Old Names to such as were of more known and familiar Use in their Time. But I have no occasion to say this, till Dr *Bentley* has clearly prov'd some of the Names of Cities Mention'd there to be later than *Phalaris*; which, I think, with all his little Skill in puzzling Accounts, he has not been able to do.

For Methods sake, he begins at the Last Epistle; from whence he cites these words; Ὑβλαῖοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς, and says, *the Sophist was careful to mention such Cities* (he means, *People*) as he knew were in *Sicily* (*a*). Which is unluckily said just in this Place, because the Sophist (if he be one) happens to mention a People that were not in *Sicily*; for in all the

(*a*) P. 15.

the Copies of *Phalaris* 'tis Ὑαλαῖοι. Indeed I guess'd it shou'd be Ὑβλαῖοι, and am therefore oblig'd not to bear hard upon him for making use of my Conjecture. Granting it therefore to be Ὑβλαῖοι, whether any of the *Sicilian Hybla*'s be here meant is dubious, and therefore he says nothing to it: but when he comes to *Phintia*, which every-body owns to be iu *Sicily*, he brings abundance of needless Authorities to prove 'tis there. One of these, *Diodorus*, says, that *Phintia* was built by *Phintias* of *Agrigent*, long enough after the Time of *Phalaris*; upon which Dr *Bentley* begins to triumph a little too hastily; imagining, he has certainly prov'd this to be the *Phintia* mention'd by the Mock-*Phalaris*. Whereas he ought to have consider'd, that *Diodorus*, in the very place he cites, says, that the *Phintia* built by *Phintias* was a *Maritime* Town *: but there's another *Phintia*, which both *Ptolemy* (*b*), and *Pliny* (*c*) tell us is a *Mediterranean* Town. Now if *Phalaris*'s Friends should be as Positive as Dr *Bentley* sometimes is with less reason, that 'tis the *Mediterranean Phintia* that's mention'd in this Epistle, how would he disprove 'em? This has certainly as good a Title to be there as his Maritime *Phintia* has; nay, according to his way of arguing in the next Paragraph from the Company that Towns keep, the case is evident in its favour; for *Hybla*, which it is here joyn'd with, is Meditterranean. Perhaps the Dr will bravely stand to what he has here inconsiderately said, that all these Authors mean the same place: if so, (which I am far from Granting) why may not *Diodorus*

* ἐν θαλάσσῃ ἦν.

(*b*) Geogr. *l.* 3, *c.* 4.

(*c*) Nat. Hist. *l.* 3, *c.* 8.

dorus be mistaken as much in the *Date* of this Town, as two Good Witnesses prove him to be in the *Situation* of it? unless this *Phintia* be such another Place as *Agrigent*, a Seaport Town in the *middle of Sicily* *. * Differt. p. 50.

From *Phintia* the Dr marches on victoriously to *Alæsa*; where he finds *Stesichorus* in danger of being *snapt* †, in his intended Journey from thence to *Himera*. And here agen he appeals to *Diodorus*, whether there was any such place as *Alæsa* in the Days of *Phalaris*. *Diodorus* gives him a less satisfactory answer than he did in the Case of *Phintia*; and tells him, that there was indeed one *Alæsa* built by *Archonides* in the 94th Olymp. (which, according to the Dr's Arithmetick, is above 120; another man would have said, above 140 Years after the last Period of *Phalaris*) but that there were several othes *Alæsa*'s in *Sicily*; and therefore *Archonides* gave this City the Appellation of *Archonidium*. So that we are at liberty to chuse any other of those *Alæsa*'s for *Phalaris*; unless Dr *Bentley* by his Arbitrary Power can confine us to *Archonidium*. He says he can, and by this Stratagem: *Alæsa* is here joyn'd with *Himera* and *Aluntium*; and the *Alæsa* of *Archonides* is upon the same Coast with these Two Cities: therefore *'tis evident from the Situation that this* Alæsa *of* Archonides *is meant in the Epistles.* A Surprizing Argument! and I verily believe his Own! if he be not too unreasonably fond of it, I desire to borrow it for One Moment, to prove just the contrary to what He has prov'd; that *this* Alæsa *is not upon the same Coast with* Aluntium. *Tully* says; *Halesini,* † Ibid. p. 16.

Ca-

Catanenſes, *Panormitani*, &c. and agen, *Halæſini*, *Catanenſes*, *Tyndaritani*, &c. * 'Tis Evident therefore that *Alæſa* is upon the ſame Coaſt with *Catana*; that is, upon the Coaſt directly oppoſite to *Auntium*. I could confound all the Geographers in the World with this Argument, but muſt detain it no longer. I return it to the Dr with Thanks, and with a Promiſe never to uſe it again. If any-body be of ſo *ſlow a Judgment*, as not to be *affected* with the evidence of this proof, the Dr, who is a man that guards againſt *all poſſible Cavils and Exceptions*, has another ready to ſupport it; which plainly ſhews, that the Alæſa *of* Archonides *muſt be meant in the Epiſtles, becauſe there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophiſt* †. The Queſtion is, whether theſe Epiſtles could be written by *Phalaris*? No, ſays Dr *Bentley*; becauſe the *Alæſa* of *Archonides* is mention'd there. But how does it appear, that, among the ſeveral *Alæſa*'s in *Sicily*, this of *Archonides* muſt needs be meant there? That, ſays he, is plain; becauſe *there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophiſt: i. e.* If a Sophiſt writ theſe Letters, he muſt needs mean the *Alæſa* of *Archonides*, becauſe there was no other then ſtanding. But the Dr forgets that he is diſputing with a ſtrange ſort of People, who won't allow that a Sophiſt writ theſe Letters; and if he could prove that a Sophiſt writ 'em, they would ſtill deny his Conſequence: for might not a Sophiſt mention a Town he had read of, tho 'twas not ſtanding in his time? If he might not, 'twill follow, that a Sophiſt could not write theſe Epiſtles, where we find

* Orr. in Verr.

† Diſſert. *p.* 17.

find the names of *Astypalaea*, *Himera*, *Zancle*, &c. Towns out of Date long before the Days of the Sophist. It has been the Dr's fortune in this Section, to use such perverse arguments, as will sooner serve to any purpose than to what he applys 'em. Instead of proving the Epistles Spurious, he has prov'd 'em Genuine; instead of setling the true place of one City, he has unsetled all the Geography that ever writ.

However he is not discourag'd with this ill Success at *Alesa*, but proceeds to give Battle to the *Zancleans*, upon the strength of an old saying and a true, πολλὰ κοινὰ τοῦ πολέμου (*a*). *Phalaris* in the 85th Epistle says, Ταυρομενίται τὰ Ταυρομένους εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα, and inscribes the 21st Epistle Μεσσηνίοις; upon which Dr *Bentley* makes this Remark: *Here we have mention made of* Zancleans *and* Messenians, *as if* Zancle *and* Messana *were two different Towns* (*b*): and agen, *the* Zancleans, *by the reckoning of* Pausanias, *had been an obsolete forgotten Word* 100 *Years before the date of these pretended Epistles* (*c*). If the Author had mention'd *Zancle* and *Messana* too, Dr *Bentley* might have said with some Grounds that he mistook 'em for *two different Towns*: but to say, he did so, from his mentioning the *Zancleans* and *Messanians*, is a Consequence too nearly related to some we have lately parted with. For from the *Messanians* taking *Zancle*, and calling it after their own Name, does it follow, that there were no *Zancleans* left in the World? Were these poor people annihilated upon the Loss of their City? A man less rash in pronouncing their Name *forgotten and obsolete* might

(*a*) Disser. p. 30.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 24.

(*c*) Disser. p. 27.

might have Suſpected, and a man better acquainted with Hiſtory might have Known, that they continu'd many Ages in a Diſtinct Body, and under the ſame Name. *Pauſanias* (*a*), where he obſerves, that during the *Meſſenians* abſence from *Peloponneſe*, but Two of their Nation won the Prize at the Olympicks, adds, that the *Sicilians ſay, theſe were not* Meſſenians, *but deſcended from the old* Zancleans *. This implys, that the *Zancleans* were not ſwallow'd up by the *Meſſanians*, but kept their Families unmix'd with their new Conquerors. And this appears more clearly from *Diodorus*, who tells us †, that in the 79th Olympiad the *Zancleans* recovered their City out of theſe Strangers hands, that had poſſeſs'd it ſo many Years. Nay, ſo far were the *Zancleans* from being *obſolete* 100 *Years before* Phalaris, that we are ſure they preſerv'd themſelves in a Separate Body even till * *Pliny*'s time, who expreſly diſtinguiſhes 'em from the *Meſſanians*; and tells us, *Meſſana* was a Free City, but the *Zancleans* were Tributaries †. Theſe Teſtimonies will ſufficiently juſtifie *Phalaris* for mentioning the *Zancleans*; and if we can bring him off as well for mentioning the *Meſſanians*, that *inexcuſable Ignorance* in this matter, which Dr *Bentley* preſſes ſo hard upon the Sophiſt, muſt lye at his own Door, till he can remove it. But this, the Dr ſays, Thucydides *will not ſuffer, who relates that, at the time of* Xerxes's *Expedition*, Anaxilaus *King of* Rhegium *beſieg'd* Zancle, *and took it*; *and call'd it* Meſſana. *Thu-*

(*a*) Eliac. *p.* 346.

* Οἱ δὲ Σικελιῶται ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀρχαίων Ζαγκλαίων, ἐξ ὧν Μεσσήνιοι φασί.

† Lib. 11.

* *L.* 3, *c.* 8.

† Meſſana *Civium Romanorum qui* Mamertini *vocantur; Latinæ conditionis* Zanclæi.

Thucydides * ſays indeed that *Anaxilaus* beat out the *Samians* from *Zancle*, and call'd it *Meſſana*; but fixes the time of this action no otherwiſe than only by ſaying, 'twas *not long after the* Samians, *flying from the* Medes, *poſſeſs'd it*. Dr *Bentley* calls this *Xerxes*'s Expedition; as if the *Medes* had never made an Incurſion upon *Greece*, till the time of *Xerxes*. I don't know how he will excuſe himſelf for miſrepreſenting that Excellent Author, but only by pleading that he has dealt as freely with others. For, after the Words laſt quoted from *Thucydides*, he adds; *the ſame ſays* Herodotus; whereas what *Herodotus* † ſays, is ſo far from being *the ſame*, that it contradicts both the Story which *Thucydides* himſelf tells, and that which Dr *Bentley* makes for him. For *Herodotus* ſays, not that *Anaxilaus* expell'd the *Samians* from *Zancle*, but that he aſſiſted 'em to take it; not that this was done at the time of *Xerxes*'s Expedition, but in the Reign of *Darius*. A Common Reader would be ſurpriz'd to hear him profeſs, immediately after theſe Two fair Citations, that he *loves to deal ingenuouſly* (*a*): but I begin now to underſtand his Figurative Expreſſions; when he offers an argument, that has no Conſequence, or Meaning in it, then his Phraſe is, *'tis Evident*; When he has tranſcrib'd two or three Pages together from another man, then he crys out, *a Diſcovery*; and when he would put a falſe Colour upon any thing, then he *loves to deal ingenuouſly*. But to deal a little more ingenuouſly than He does, I will give his Authorities all the force

* L. 5. §. 5.

† L. 6.

(*a*) Diſſer. *p.* 25.

force that they will bear, tho' not all that he lays upon 'em; and then consider, how far the Positive Testimony of *Pausanias* may prevail against 'em. That *Anaxilaus* chang'd the Name of *Zancle* into *Messana* is agreed between Dr *Bentley* and Me; the only question is about the Date of this Change. *Thucydides* fixes upon no date: *Diodorus* places the Death of One *Anaxilaus* in the 76th Olympiad; but does not say, this was the *Anaxilaus* that nam'd *Messana*. *Herodotus*, in the place cited, says nothing about the Change of the Names, but tells a Story of the *Samians* seizing *Zancle*, a little after *Miletus* was taken; that is, about the 70th Olympiad: and all the Ground we have, from this Passage of *Herodotus*, to conclude the Change of the Name *Zancle* into *Messana* to have happen'd after this time, is, his calling the City *Zancle*, and not *Messana*, throughout this Story: which I think, proves nothing more, than that the Old Name was not yet so utterly abolish'd, but that it was call'd indifferently either *Zancle*, or *Messana* still: and this I take to be the most Natural Interpretation of another Passage in *Herodotus* *, (which I shall produce in Terms because Dr *Bentley* has not) where, having occasion to mention *Zancle*, after the *Samians* had possess'd it, he calls it *Zancle* still; only letting us know, that it had also a New Name, *Messana*. So that hitherto we have had no direct and positive Testimony about the Time of *Zancle*'s changing

* Ὁ Κάδμος οὗτος —— οἴχετο εἰς Σικελίην· ἔνθα μετὰ Σαμίων ἐσχέ τε καὶ κατοίκησε πόλιν Ζάγκλην, τὴν εἰς Μεσσήνην μετὰ βαλοῦσθαι τοὔνομα· L. 7, § 164.

changing its Name. *Pauſanias* is the only Author, that ſpeaks fully up to the point; and He expreſly affirms this to have happen'd in the 29th Olympiad, and tells the Story with a great deal of Solemnity and Circumſtance. He ſays, the Flight of thoſe *Meſſenians* [who nam'd *Meſſana*] was after the taking of *Ira* by the *Lacedæmonians*, in the 28th Olympiad, when *Chionis* the *Spartan* carried the Prize the *firſt* time (*a*): that, upon their Flight, *Anaxilaus* Prince of *Rhegium*, who had War with the *Zancleans*, invited 'em to joyn with him; that they did ſo, and together with his Forces took *Zancle*; and had it given 'em to inhabit, and new nam'd it *Meſſana*, in the 29th Olympiad; when the ſame *Chionis* won the Prize the *Second* time (*b*). That this *Anaxilaus* was the Great Grandſon of *Alcidamidas*, who fled with his Family from *Meſſene* to *Rhegium*, after the taking of *Ithome*, and the Death of *Ariſtodemus* (*c*); which happen'd (he tells us in another place *) the firſt Year of the 14th Olympiad, that is about *Threeſcore Years* before; ſo that all the little particulars of *Pauſanias*'s whole Story are adjuſted with the utmoſt exactneſs: He ſpeaks home to the point, ſo, as to leave no poſſible room for interpreting his Words to any other Senſe; and we have as much reaſon to depend upon him in This, as in Any Æra of Chronology whatever that he has laid down throughout his Writings. And that *Pauſanias*, who gives us this account, was not unacquainted with what

(*a*) P. 259, 260.

(*b*) P. 260, 261.

(*c*) P. 260.

* P. 251.

* Τὸν δὲ Σμίκυθον τοῦτον Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς Ἀναξίλα τοῦ ἐν Ῥηγίῳ τυραννήσαντος, &c. Eliac. *p.* 340.

Herodotus had said, appears from his quoting *Herodotus* *, in relation to *Micythus*, the Servant of *Anaxilaus*: so that this cannot be thought an Error of his, owning to his want of Memory, or sufficient Light; but his fix'd and settled Judgment after the Matter had been by him throughly consider'd: And doubtless, when he laid down this Account so peremptorily and with so much Exactness, he had such Authorities in his View, as he judg'd sufficient to bear him out in it; and to be more than a Counterpoyse to the Testimony of *Herodotus*; which he rejects, not only as to the Age of *Anaxilaus*, but as to the Circumstances of his Life also; giving us a very different relation of them. The most Eminent Chronologers, and Men best vers'd in these things, (having never seen that *whole Tenor of History confirm'd by so many Synchronisms and Concurrences*, which, I suppose, Dr *Bentley* keeps by him in reserve) fall in with this account of *Pausanias*. *Ubbo Emmius* follows it, in his *History of Ancient* Greece (*a*); *Lydiat*, in his Notes on the *Chronicon Marmoreum*; *Joseph Scaliger*, in his *Animadversions* upon *Eusebius* (*b*); and in his Ἀναγραφὴν Ὀλυμπιάδων †: so does *Petavius* too (*c*), who never agrees with *Scaliger* when he can help it; and *Meursius* (*d*), who has a distinct Chapter on this Subject. To sum up our Evidence then; against an Indirect and Dubious Proof, built

(*a*) L. 1. *p.* 18.

(*b*) P. 27.

† *It was compos'd by* Scaliger *himself, tho many Learned Men have quoted it since, as an Ancient Piece.*

(*c*) Rat. Temp. *par.* 1, *p.* 38.

(*d*) Lect. Att. *l.* 2. *c.* 23.

built chiefly on a Disputable Passage in *Herodotus*, we have the express, and full, and undoubted Authority of *Pausanias*; and the Opinions of *Ubbo Emmius*, *Lydiat*, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *and Meursius*, to counterpoise Dr *Bentley's*: and if these are not Enough to do it, I promise the Dr to throw half a dozen more into the Scale, the next time he and I talk together.

In the same Epistle, from whence Dr *Bentley* took an occasion of giving us this large and ingenuous account of *Zancle* and *Messana*, the *Tauromenites* were mention'd with the *Zancleans*; [Ταυρομενείτας, καὶ Ζαγκλείους εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα] upon which I expected, that, when he had dispatch'd the *Zancleans*, he would have fallen upon the *Tauromenites*: but to shew his Aversion to any thing that looks like Order or Method, he postpones 'em, to intermix some Proofs of a different Nature. I have already excus'd my self from following him in his Rambles, and shall consider *Tauromenium* here in its proper place. The only Authority he has brought to prove *Tauromenium* so nam'd since the time of *Phalaris*, is that of *Diodorus*, which I mention'd in my Preface; and own'd to be a clear Proof against *Phalaris*, if it might be rely'd on. But *Diodorus* is in two Stories, which, as Dr *Bentley* (after his way of citing Authors) has put 'em together, look plausibly enough; but, as *Diodorus* himself tells 'em, are utterly inconsistent. In his 14th Book he says, that some *Sicilians* planed themselves upon *Taurus*, and from their Settlement there call'd the place they built,

Tauromenium: In the 16th Book, he ſays, that about 40 Years after this, *Andromachus* planted ſome of the Old *Naxians* upon *Taurus*; and from his long ſtay there call'd the place where he planted 'em, *Tauromenium*. Thus *Diodorus* plainly gives us Two different accounts of the Time when the Place was *nam'd*; either of which, I confeſs, would ſerve Dr *Bentley*'s purpoſe: but ſince they contradict one another, neither of them is to be depended on. If Dr *Bentley* pleads, that they do not contradict one-another, becauſe the Place might be twice call'd ſo, for One and the Same Reaſon; why will not the Same Reaſon equally hold for its being call'd ſo, long before *Phalaris* liv'd? Doubtleſs the *Sicilians* had often before his time reſorted to the Strong Holds of that Mountain. Nay, *Thucydides* expreſly tells us (*a*), that there were of old People that inhabited the Hilly parts about *Naxos*: and 'tis not improbable, that Theſe might be call'd Ταυρομενῖται before they were form'd into any Politick Body; and afterwards, when they were collected together, and a City was built (tho' we don't know when that was) that City might be call'd *Tauromenium*. 'Tis obſervable that *Phalaris*, tho' he has very often occaſion to mention theſe People, yet never names any ſuch Town as *Tauromenium*; never calls 'em *Citizens*, nor uſes any ſuch Expreſſion as implys, they belong'd to any *City*. This could ſcarce have happen'd, if a Sophiſt had writ theſe Letters: but 'tis no wonder that *Phalaris* ſhould write ſo; becauſe there might be *Tauromenites*, as there was a River

(*a*) L. 6. S. 15.

Tauro-

Tauromenius (if *Vibius Sequeſter* be to be credited, who ſays the Town had its name from thence) before there was a *Tauromenium*. So that Dr *Bentley* would have no reaſon to triumph over the Defenders of *Phalaris*, if he could prove *Tauromenium* of a Later Date; much leſs, ſince he cannot prove it, ought he ſo inſultingly to call upon 'em, *Where are thoſe that cry up* Phalaris *for the ſlorid Author of theſe Letters, who was burnt in his Own Bull above* 150 *Years before* Tauromenium *was ever thought of* (*a*)? E're I anſwer this Queſtion, I deſire to ask Him one: Where does he find that *Phalaris* was burnt in his *Bull*? Does this Great Hiſtorian take up with the Trifling Author of the Verſes upon *Ibis*; when ſo many Grave Writers have given us a different account of *Phalaris*'s Death? In another place indeed he cites *Heraclides* for this Story; but, as I have already obſerv'd, falſly. However, *Phalaris*'s *being burnt in his Bull before* Tauromenium *was thought on*, was ſo refreſhing a Quibble, that he would rather venture upon Falſe Hiſtory, than loſe it. The Witticiſm is ſomething remote, as it ſtands here; but when he is at leiſure to put this Diſſertation into Latin, 'twill receive a Great Advantage.

(*a*) Diſſer. P. 31.

'Twas not to be hop'd, that theſe Obſecure Points concerning the *Building and Peopling Ancient Towns* ſhould be ſo far clear'd and ſettl'd, as to make 'em amount to a Plain and Direct Proof againſt the Epiſtles: However it was a piece of Learning not unworthy of a Scholar's Pains; and by a Skilful Hand might have been made uſeful to ſome Other purpoſe. I would not therefore be thought to diſparage Dr *Bentley* for enquiring into this matter, tho' he has happen'd to leave it more obſcure than he found it; His Attempt was Commendable, whatever his Succeſs has been: but Now, methinks, he ſtoops very low; from the Riſe and *Æra's* of *Cities*, to the *Chronology* of *Old Sayings* and *Proverbs*. This would make a much more ſuitable *Appendix* to a *Vocabulary*, than to an Hiſtory of *Ancient and Modern Learning*. 'Tis ſo dry and fruitleſs, and ſo little to the purpoſe, that I am almoſt tempted to break my promiſe, and leave this part of his Diſſertation unexamin'd. While Men of Different Times have a Like Frame of Soul, and meet with Like Accidents of Life, *i. e.* while they have the ſame Faculties, and the ſame Occaſions of thinking, what Wonder is it, that they ſhould happen upon the ſame Reflection? or that Authors, who write the ſame Language, and upon the ſame Subject, ſhould put the ſame Two Words together? Yet this is what aſtoniſhes Dr *Bentley*; he cannot believe, that there ſhould be ſo ſtrange a

Jump-

Jumping of Good Wits, without ſome *filching* *: and therefore concludes, theſe Letters muſt be be writ, not by *Phalaris* himſelf, but by a *Secratary* (*a*) of his; who is not ſo Dutiful as a Secretary ſhould be in attending his Maſter, for he comes a Thouſand Years after him.

The Dr takes this Secretary *tripping* (*b*) in his uſe of the Proverb πίτυος δίκην, of which the Dr can prove *Cræſus* to be the *Author*; becauſe, *when he ſent a Meſſage to the* Lampſaceni, *that if they did not ſet* Miltiades *free, he would extirpate 'em* πίτυος τρόπον, *the men of* Lampſacus *underſtood not the meaning of that Expreſſion*; *The Phraſe*, he ſays, *puzzl'd the whole City* (*c*): What if it did? muſt an Expreſſion needs be *New and Unheard of*, becauſe the Mayor and Aldermen of *Lampſacus*, and perhaps the Recorder too, did not apprehend it? But how does he prove, *it puzzl'd the* WHOLE *City*? plainly! becauſe One of the *Eldeſt Citizens hit upon't, and told the meaning of it.* This is very Nice Reaſoning: but he goes on to refine upon it; and ſuſpects that Herodotus *himſelf was the firſt Broacher of that Expreſſion*: for (ſays he) *thoſe firſt Hiſtorians made every-bodys Speeches for 'em.* Therefore *Herodotus* made this, which is no *Speech*, but only a *Meſſage*! However, let *Herodotus* have worded this Meſſage; does the ſame *Herodotus* tell us, that the *Lampſacenes* were puzzl'd with an Expreſſion invented by *Herodotus*? Were the Men of *Lampſacus* in *Cræſus*'s time at a Loſs to underſtand a Phraſe, that was not thought of, till *Herodotus* an Hundred Years afterwards

* Differt. p. 33.

(*a*) Ibid. p. 38.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 27.

(*c*) Ibid.

coin'd it? 'Tis wonderful to Me, how ſuch a Piece of Reaſoning as this could ever enter into an Head that has Brains in it! All the Dr has to countenance it, is the *Title* of a *Loſt Chapter* in *Gellius*; from whence he takes occaſion to gueſs at what's Loſt there, and to give us a wrong Tranſlation of what's Left: *Cæſam*, which in *Herodotus*'s Greek is ἐκκοπεῖσα, he renders *Lopp'd*, inſtead of *Cut down*: Now, that a Pinetree *periſhes by Lopping*, is, I believe, News to the Naturaliſts. I could not avoid taking notice of this little Miſtake becauſe he repeats it over and over again; and endeavours, in his awkward way, to ſqueeze Mirth out of it. *Gellius* indeed, remembring a Paſſage in *Herodotus*, where it was affirm'd, that the Pine was the only Tree, which would not ſhoot out after it was cut down, might ſay, *Quòd parùm verè dixerit Herodotus*, &c. becauſe he did not nicely examin upon what Occaſion this was brought in by *Herodotus*; or what was ſaid *in Herodotus*, he might in a Quotition ſay well enough, was ſaid *by* him: but to tell us the Story of the *Lampſacenes* being at a Loſs to underſtand the Meſſage of *Cræſus*, and yet to think this Expreſſion firſt broach'd by *Herodotus*, is ſuch an Inſtance of *Oſcitation* (*a*), as I could not eaſily imagine, that even Our Diſſertator could be guilty of. He tells us of *Dreaming Pedants, with their Elbows on their Desks*; but ſurely the Man that writ this muſt have been faſt aſleep; or elſe his Imagination could never have rambled at this rate. If *Herodotus* is to be believ'd, *Cræſus* us'd

(*a*) P. 119.

us'd this Expreſſion; if he is not to be believ'd, why is he brought to prove any thing? *Herodotus* is ſo far from aſſerting that *Cræſus* was the Author of this Proverbial Saying, that from this very Story we may gather, that he was not the Author of it: For when he ſent a Meſſage to the *Lampſacenes*, which he expected ſhould immediately be obey'd, would he put it into ſuch a Phraſe as they were not likely to apprehend? It ſtands to reaſon, that he thought the Expreſſion Common enough; or elſe he would not have us'd it on this occaſion. All that we certainly learn from *Herodotus* is, that this Saying muſt be as Old, at leaſt, as *Cræſus*; from whence one would be apt to conclude it to be probably as Old as *Phalaris*, who is plac'd but very few Years above him.

When the Dr's head ran upon Old Sayings, how came *Nihil eſt dictum quod non dictum prius*, to eſcape him? This One, well apply'd, would have done him more ſervice than all the *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Engliſh* Proverbs with which he embelliſhes his Diſſertation; it would have ſhew'd him, how vain it is to pretend to trace the Originals of Words and Phraſes; and that even the *Æra's* of Cities may be fix'd much ſooner than They. However the Dr launches ſtill out into further Diſcoveries of this kind; he has met with a *Sentence of Moral* *, λόγον ἔργα σοφά: which *notable Saying*, he tells us, *had not* Phalaris *modeſtly hinted that Others had ſaid it before him, we might have taken for his Own.* He ſeems here to blame *Phalaris* for being *modeſt*, and for hinting that he borrow'd this Expreſſion

* *Diſſert.* p. 33.

pression from *others*, when he might as well have put it upon us for his *own*: the Dr, I believe will never be blam'd upon either of these accounts. But would he really have taken this Saying for *Phalaris*'s Own, if there had been no hint of his borrowing it? and yet when *Phalaris* says, 'tis Older than himself, will he take it to be Younger? He reckons up several Authors that pretend to it, *Democritus*, *Simonides*, and the *Lacedæmonians*; and decides in favour of *Democritus*, for a very good reason; because otherwise it would be of no use to him in the present Debate. But I am so far from yielding it up to *Democritus*, that I say *Democritus* lays no claim to it. *Plutarch* says, Λόγος ἔργου σκιὴ καὶ Δημόκριτον; perhaps he had met with this in some Passage in *Democritus*'s Works: but it will not follow from hence, that *Democritus* was the Author of it. Many *Proverbial Gnomæ*, in all Languages, are to be met with in the Dr's Dissertation; but No-body will allow this Way of Arguing from 'em; Either these *Gnomæ* are Dr *Bentley*'s own, or else he is a *Sorry Plagiary*. *Laertius*, the other Witness produc'd for *Democritus*, is as far from making *Democritus* the Author of this Sentence, as *Plutarch* is. In his Life of *Democritus* we find, Τούτου ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ, Λόγος ἔργου σκιὴ· But in another place he tells us (*a*), *Solon* us'd to say, λόγον εἴδωλον εἶναι τῶν ἔργων: So that *Democritus*, according to *Laertius*'s account, and Dr *Bentley*'s Reasoning, must still have *filch'd* this Saying. And from the Variety of Opinions concerning the Original of it, I have more reason to suppose it older than *Phalaris*,

(*a*) Life of *Solon*.

ris, than Dr *Bentley* has to presume it Later. Here are Four Authors that have an Equal Pretence to it; and if it be given to any of the Four, except *Democritus*, *Phalaris* might have us'd it after him: but I rather think that none of 'em have any Title to it. It is not an Observation of so deep a Reach, but that it might have been hit upon an hundred times, by Men no wiser than Dr *Bentley*, or my self, before the Pens of *Phalaris* or *Democritus* made it famous.

Dr *Bentley* goes on detecting *Phalaris*'s Thefts; but for Ornaments sake, the Phrase is varied. He finds him, in the next Paragraph, *filching* a *Moral Sentence* *; in the Last, it was a *Sentence of Moral*: which is the Only Change of Style, that I have observ'd in Dr *Bentley*'s Dissertation for the better; and therefore I ought to give him the Praise of it. The Moral Sentence is this, Θνητὸς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασί τινες οὐ προσήκει: which is stollen, he says, from an *Iambic* Verse cited in *Aristotle*'s Rhetoric, Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε θνητὸς ὤν. But why might not this Iambic Verse be as well stollen from *Phalaris*? or why might not both the Poet and the Prince be equally beholden to a Moral Sentence more ancient than either of them? Were there no Moral Sentences before the Days of *Phalaris*? Or, supposing the Letter-writer had this Iambic Verse in his Eye, how does it appear, that this Verse was not Older than *Phalaris*? *Aristotle*, who cites it without a Name, leaves us in the dark, as to the Time of it. And how will the Dr's Conjecturing Faculty help him out here? will he pretend by *the*

* Disser. p. 35.

Thread

Thread and Colour of its Style to judge to what Century it belongs? Ay, but it is *a Proverbial Gnome*, he says, and therefore *PROBABLY borrow'd from the Stage*; and *CONSEQUENTLY must be later than* Phalaris, *let it belong to what Poet You please, Tragic or Comic* (*a*). Why more *probably* borrow'd from the *Stage*, than from *Archilochus*'s Iambicks? the Fragments of which are full of those Wise Sayings, which Dr *Bentley* calls *Proverbial Gnoma*; and which do not, I think, look a whit the Wiser, for having that Hard Name given 'em. But should I grant him his *Probably*, yet his *Consequently* I can never allow; because I am very well satisfied, that there were both Tragic and Comic Poets before the Days of *Phalaris*. I shall talk with the Dr about the Age of *Tragedy* in another Article; here I shall consider *Comedy* only. The *Chronicon Marmoreum* informs us, that it was brought into *Athens* by *Susarion*; or rather, that a * *Stage* for the acting of Comedies was by him first erected in *Athens*: the Date is indeed worn out of the Marble; but it must be before the Tyranny of *Pisistratus*, with which the next Epoch begins: and the Tyranny of *Pisistratus* Dr *Bentley* owns (*b*) to have been something before that of *Phalaris*. Those Learned Men, who have taken pains to illustrate this Chronicle, have by the Concurrence of Other Histories plainly shewn, that the time of *Susario* must fall between the 610th and 489th Year before *Christ*. Take fairly the Middle of this account; and it falls out

(*a*) Differ. p. 35.

* ΑΦ ΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΣ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΕΤΕΘΗ ΕΝ ΣΑΝΙΣΙ, &c. Ep. 40. ἐν *Cavea*· *i. e. in Scena Tabulatâ.*

(*b*) Differ. p. 41.

out before the Reign of *Phalaris*. Mr *Selden* indeed, and ſome others, would have *Suſario* the ſame with *Sannyrio*, which would bring him down to *Ariſtophanes*'s time; but the Excellent Biſhop *Pearſon*, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* (*a*), has prov'd beyond all Controverſie, that *Suſario* is a diſtinct Poet from *Sannyrio*, and older by above 140 Years. But Comedy was yet Older than *Suſario* himſelf; for it was Older than the Word by which it was call'd in *Suſario*'s time, and had the ſame Common Name with Tragedy, long before the Diviſion of Dramatic Poetry into thoſe Two diſtinct Branches was form'd; as I ſhall prove from *Athenæus*, and Others, hereafter, in my Enquiry into the Origin of Tragedy. *Suſario* was only the Improver of Comedy, as I ſhall ſhew *Theſpis* to have been of *Tragedy*: He poliſh'd it firſt perhaps, and gave it ſomething of a Regular Caſt; which was handle enough for *Diomedes Grammaticus* (*b*), the Scholiaſt on *Ariſtophanes* (*c*), and *Clemens Alexandrinus* (*d*), to attribute the Invention of it to him. But that he was not the Inventor of it, the Marble it ſelf does more than intimate; when it ſays only of him, that he firſt erected a *Stage* in *Athens*, to act Comedies upon. Indeed the Cities were beholden to the Villages for the Uſe of both Tragedy and Comedy; as we learn from *Ariſtotle* (*e*): In the Country they began, and continu'd ſome time rude and unform'd, till the City took 'em out of the Peaſants hands, and poliſh'd 'em. Allowing then Dr *Bentley* all his unreaſonable Demands; that *Phalaris* had a regard to the Iambick Verſe cited by *Ariſtotle*, and that

(*a*) P. 2, 10, 11.

(*b*) L. 3.
(*c*) In *Prolegom.*
(*d*) Strom. *l.* 1.
(*e*) Poet. *l.* 1

That

That Verse belong'd to the Stage: yet we see, it might belong to the Stage, and be more ancient than *Phalaris*.

Our *Critic* himself seems but ill satisfied with this Proof, (a Thing which rarely happens to him!) and therefore casts about for Another; and will find this Saying somewhere else. I see the Charge of Theft begins to clear up; we shall easily Quash an Indictment, that is thus laid in Two Places. Well! but who is this Second Author, that *Phalaris* has purloin'd? why, *Euripides*, in his *Philoctetes*. *And*, says Dr *Bentley* *, *from* Aristophanes *the famous Grammarian* (*who* (*after* Aristotle, Callimachus, *and Others*) *writ the* διδασκαλίαι, *a Work* (*were it now extant*) *most useful to Ancient History*) *we know, that this very Fable* Philoctetes *was written* Olymp. 87; *which is* CXX *Years after the Tyrant's Destruction.* Was ever *Scholiast* urg'd to clear a more Knotty Point? or urg'd more Knottily? He might as well from the *Chronicon Marmoreum*, compar'd with *Langbain*'s *Fasti*, have undertaken to prove, that *Thespis* was before *Dryden*. *Euripides*'s Words are,

* P. 36.

Ὥσπερ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφυ,
Οὕτω προσήκει μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον ——

Now (says the Dr) *to him that compares these with the Words of the Epistle, 'twill be EVIDENT, that the Author had this very Passage before his Pen: there is* ἔχειν *and* προσήκει; *not only a Sameness of Sense, but even of Words, and those not necessary to the Sentence: which could not fall out by Accident.* All that is *Evident*

dent, I think, is, that there is a *Sameneſs of Reaſoning* runs throughout the Dr's whole Diſſertation: let *Phalaris* ſhift for himſelf; I am reſolv'd not to anſwer this Argument. Inſtead on't, I ſhall be bold to make an Objection to the Dr, which I deſire him to anſwer; and that is, whether it were proper and prudent in him, to accuſe *Phalaris* of a Theft, by a Pair of Quotations pillag'd from my poor Notes on this Epiſtle? and whether, among his other *Proverbial Gnoma*, he ſhould not have conſider'd That about *the Old Woman in the Oven?*

Hitherto *Phalaris* has ſtollen diſcreetly, and borrow'd Expreſſions proper for him to uſe; but now, it ſeems, he ſteals without Decency or Diſtinction, out of *Callimachus*, and *Pindar*. For we find Two Words cloſe together in Him, that are found as near one another in each of thoſe Authors. *Phalaris* has ἐτέρῳ δαίμονι, *Pindar* has δαίμων ἕτερος, and *Callimachus* ἕτερος δαίμων: the Dr is in a *Quandary* here to determine, which of theſe *Phalaris* made bold with; Pindar *he ſhould be inclin'd to gueſs*, but that he is more inclin'd to gueſs 'tis *Callimachus*. Indeed *Callimachus*, *Dorizing* in this point, is One Letter farther off from him than *Pindar*: but then agen in Another place, which has nothing to do with This place, *Callimachus* has Two Other Words exactly the ſame. So that between *Pindar* and *Callimachus*, and *Callimachus* and *Pindar*, the Dr is, as I obſerv'd, in a Great *Quandary*. To relieve him in this Streight, I take leave to give him my Opinion, that *Phalaris* might rob

rob neither: for I can see nothing so Extraordinary in these Words, but that a much less Man than *Phalaris* might have hit upon 'em. The Dr fancies, he sees *a Quaintness something Poetical in the Expression*; a Man, that dealt less Tenderly with Him than I, would be apt to fancy, he saw a Quaintness something Pedantical in the Observation. Which of the Words is Poetical, ἕτερος or δαίμων? ἕτερος has no other Sense here *, than it has wherever 'tis us'd in any Prose Author: for the Dr may refine upon it, as he pleases; it signifies here neither more nor less than *Another*; tho' being oppos'd to εὐτυχούντων, this *Other* Fortune must, by construction, be understood to mean *Ill* Fortune. Is δαίμων then Poetical? 'tis taken here for τύχη; in what Author almost is it not taken so? I could be very Learned here in my Citations; and, if I follow'd Great Examples, 'twould be a proper occasion, for there's no Need of 'em: I will only in the Margin point out to the Dr a Place or two from *Dionysius Halicarnassens* (*a*), and *Æschines*; and put him in mind of those words of *Eustathius*, Τῶν μέσων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ δαίμων, καὶ ἡ τύχη, καὶ ἀμφιῤῥέπως ἔχουσιν αἱ λέξεις πρὸς εὔνοιαν ἀγαθόν τε καὶ μὴ τοιαύτην, &c.

* *Phalaris*'s Words are, ὧν εὐτυχούντων κἂν αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακῶ δαίμονι, ἡσθεὶς οὐδὲν ἧττον εὐτυχεῖν δόξω· *Ep.* 12.

(*a*) τῇ μὲν ὀδύρεσθαί τε πρὸς φέρειν τὸν ἑαυτῆς δαίμονα περιῆν· p. 172. — τὸν ἑαυτῆς κἀκείνου δαίμονα κατοδυρομένη· p. 180.

(*b*) Τὸν δαίμονα, καὶ τὴν τύχην τὴν συμπαρακολουθοῦσαν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ φυλάξασθαι· In Ctesiph. *p.* 94. Ed. Ox.

Tully, in his Third *Philippic*, has these Two Expressions, *Fatum extremum Reipublicæ*, and *Magna Vis est, magnum Numen Deum & idem sen-*

ſentientis Senatûs. Fatum extremum and *Numen* here have, in my Judgment, ſomething more of the Air of Poetry in 'em, than ὑπερ δαίμων; and accordingly we find the Firſt of 'em once, and the Laſt often us'd in that Senſe by *Virgil.* But I ſuppoſe No-body will be ſo wild as to inferr any thing from thence to the diſadvantage of that *Philippic.* The ſame is to be ſaid for the Words Ὄλεθρον εὗρε in the 122d Epiſtle, which with great Sagacity he finds in *Callimachus.* The Latin of that Greek, *Invenere Tormentum*, is in *Horace:* will he reject at Random any Proſe-writer, in whom I can find theſe Two Words together? if he will, I'll engage, at a venture, to find 'em. But till I know his Mind, I deſire to be excus'd from the Trouble: for, begging the Dr's pardon, I take *Index-hunting* after Words and Phraſes, to be, next *Anagrams* and *Acroſticks*, the loweſt Diverſion a Man can betake himſelf to.

As trifling as theſe Two Criticiſms are, yet Dr *Bentley* is ſo fond of 'em, that, to make 'em immortal, he has lately reprinted 'em, with his *Fragments of Callimachus.* 'Tis the only part of his Diſſertation, which, notwithſtanding his Threatnings, he has yet thought fit to put into Latin; and, if I gueſs right, 'tis the only part that he ever will.

THE Laſt Sort of Proof the Dr has employ'd to ſhew the Epiſtles Younger than *Phalaris*, is the uſe of ſome *Terms*, or *Words of Art*, which were invented, he ſays, after *Phalaris*'s time: he inſtances in theſe Three, *Thericlean Cups* (*a*), *Philoſophy* (*b*), and *Tragedy* (*c*). In

(*a*) § III.
(*b*) § X.
(*c*) § XI.

In the 7oth Epiſtle, among other things with which *Phalaris* preſents his Phyſician, mention is made of *Ten Couple of the Cups of Thericles*; whom our Critic thinks he can prove to be a *Corinthian Potter*, that liv'd an CXX Years after *Phalaris*. Before he proves it, I beg leave to interpoſe a Gueſs, about the true Reading of this Paſſage; which, if accepted, may ſave both Him and Us the trouble of his Learned Argument. The Text of *Phalaris*, as it ſtands now, is, Καὶ Ποτηρίων Θηριακλείων ζεύγη δέκα; what if it ſhould heretofore have been Ποτηρίων θ' Ἡρακλείων &c? 'Tis a very inconſiderable Alteration, and yet it ſalves all: for that there was ſuch a Cup, nam'd from *Hercules*, and therefore Old enough for *Phalaris* to uſe, *Athenæus*, and *Tully* will inform us; the firſt of which, in his *Catalogue of Cups*, mentions the Ἡράκλειον as a diſtinct ſort, in one place (*a*), and σκύφῳ Ἡρακλειακὸς in another *: and the Latter reckons up Two *Heraclean Cups* † among the Wealth of *Verres*, which he had amaſs'd together out of *Sicily*; the very place where the Scene of theſe Letters lay.

(*a*) P. 469.

* Vide *Caſaub. Anim.* p. 782.

† *Dicitur habere eum perbona Toreumata; in his pocula duo quædam quæ* Heraclea *nominantur.* Act. 6 in Verr.

This ſmall Alteration, which I take the Liberty to ſuggeſt, might eaſily creep into the Old MSS, that were in Capitals, without any diſtinction of Words: There the Original Reading might have been ΠΟΤΗΡΙΩΝΘΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΩΝ; and afterwards, by a ſlight Change of an A into an L, it might be corrupted into what it is Now by ſome Tranſcriber, whoſe Head was full of the *Thericlean Cup*; and who liv'd when the *Heraclean Cup* was diſus'd and forgotten.

And

And this is not the Only Inſtance we have of One of theſe Names being miſtaken for the Other; the *Archon* in the 61ſt *Olympiad*, whoſe Name in *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (*a*) is Ἡρακλῆς, in *Diodorus* (*b*) is call'd Θερικλῆς: and ſuch a Change, I hope, might happen in theſe Epiſtles, as has certainly happen'd in One of thoſe Authors. Nay, *Salmaſius* (*c*) will not allow the Preſent Reading of *Heraclea Pocula*, in the Oration againſt *Verres*; but, like a true Critic, without any Authority, ſubſtitutes *Thericlea*, in the room of it; and ſays, it muſt be receiv'd as an *undoubted* alteration: not remembring, I ſuppoſe, Then, that *Athenæus* had ſaid any thing of a Cup nam'd from *Hercules*, tho' but Two Pages afterwards he quotes the very Place in him where 'tis mention'd. A Candid Reader then, that conſiders what ado there is made about the Θερίκλειος κύλιξ in Philologers, and how rarely the Ἡράκλειον is mention'd, will perhaps think this Conjecture of mine not Improbable, and grant me the benefit of it. But Dr *Bentley*, I believe, will enter his Proteſt: I remember a Saying of his, with relation to a Word in *Tully*, which *Quintilian* read otherwiſe than He would have had him: *But I*, ſays he, *would not believe* Cicero *to have ſaid ſo, tho'* Cicero *himſelf ſhould affirm it*: and deſpairing therefore to get this Poor Gueſs of mine to paſs with him, I muſt even take *the Term* as I find it in *Phalaris*, and ſee how far it affects our preſent Argument.

(*a*) Ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἡρακλείδου, Ὀλυμπ. ξδ. p. 244.

(*b*) Ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Θερικλέους τοῦ καὶ τὸν ξδ' Ὀλυμπ. Excerpt. è Diodoro, *p.* 241.

(*c*) Plin. Exerc. *p.* 735. *Ita vulgò legitur, ſed vix mihi dubium eſt, quin legendum ſit* Thericlea.

Ego verò Ciceronem ita ſcripſiſſe ne Ciceroni quidem ipſi affirmanti crediderim. Ep. ad Mill. in fin. Malal. *p.* 80.

To fix the Age of *Thericles*, from whom theſe Cups are preſum'd to have their Name, the Dr cites *Athenæus*; *One Witneſs indeed, but as GOOD as a Multitude*, he ſays, *in a matter of this nature* *; he might as well, I think, have ſaid *as Many*: for why ſhould One Witneſs be as Good as a Multitude in Caſes of this Nature? in Other Caſes, I am ſure, it is not: He may attaint *Phalaris* indeed upon a Single Evidence, but he can never in the Common Courſe of Juſtice convict him; and yet the Dr promiſes us to give him *a Fair and Impartial Tryal* †. If now there are ſeveral material Circumſtances that diſparage this One Witneſs's Teſtimony; if he liv'd at a great diſtance from the Time he writes of; if he ſpeaks by Report and Hearſay only, without vouching any Authority; if he expreſſes himſelf ſo, that we have room to doubt whether we know his mind; or, ſhould we know his mind, yet if he contradicts himſelf immediately afterward: I ſay, if theſe things appear againſt him, then this *One Witneſs* is ſo far from being as good as a *Multitude*, that he is as good *as None*. And I believe That will appear to be the Caſe, after I have examin'd him.

* Diſſert. p. 19.

* P. 19.

Had *Athenæus* given us an account of the Author of an Invention in his Own Time, or a little before him, we could eaſily have credited him upon his Word: but when he ſpeaks of an Invention of 600 Years ſtanding, and pretends nicely to fix the *Date* of it, without telling us from what Author he drew his Account, we may be allow'd to ſuſpect his Exactneſs. His Miſtakes, where he depends upon his *Memory*, or even upon his *Commonplacebook* (*a*), without conſulting the

(*a*) *Sæpe Athenæum peccare graviter dum ſuorum Excerptorum fidem ſequitur, neq; ad fontes ipſos adit, multis locis probatum nobis ſatis ſuperque.* Anim. p. 377.

ver

very Authors themſelves, are frequently taken notice of by his Learned Editor; and he could not miſtake in a point that leſs deſerv'd to be remember'd than this. Had he known himſelf from what Author he drew this account, he would without fail have told us; for he treads not a ſingle Step without an Authority, if he can have one: and we may therefore conclude, that he had none; and that the only reaſon, which determin'd him to fix the Age of *Thericles* about *Ariſtophanes*'s time was, that he had not ſet down in his *Adverſaria*, nor did at preſent call to mind a mention of the *Thericlean* Cup in any Writer more ancient than He. For obſervable it is, that among the ſeveral Quotations in which he abounds on this head, there is none that runs higher than the Age of that Poet. One there is, and but One, brought from a Loſt Play of his, *Philonides*, where the *Thericlean* Cup is mention'd, at large; but not a word ſaid, by which we can make any Gueſs at the Age of *Thericles*. Our Critic indeed is of opinion, that *in all probability* Athenæus *had this Indication* [about the Age of *Thericles*] *from ſome Play of* Ariſtophanes *now Loſt, where that* Corinthian *was mention'd as one then alive* (*a*). But in all probability, *Athenæus* had not this Indication from any ſuch Paſſage; becauſe Then, in all Probability, he would have been ſo Communicative as to have let his Readers have it too. Had *Ariſtophanes* nam'd *Thericles*, as *Living*, in any of his Plays, and had this been *Athenæus*'s reaſon for making 'em Cotemporary, is it credible, that among ſo many other Paſſages he produces, relating to *Thericles*, he would have omitted This, that was worth all the reſt, and

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 19.

settl'd that very point of Chronology past dispute, which he was then laying down? especially, since he had not overloaded us on this Head, with *Aristophanes*'s Verses; having cited him but *Once*; whereas *Alexis*, a Writer of much less Character, is produc'd *four times* to it, within the compass of Twenty Citations! Could he be so Lavish, where there was no need of it? and so Sparing where the very Stress of the Point lay? I have no great Opinion either of *Athenæus*'s Judgment or Exactness, (and when I say so, I speak but the Words of *Casaubon* (*a*); however, I cannot think him Injudicious and Careless to such a Degree as this: and therefore I conclude, that he brought no Quotation of this kind out of *Aristophanes*, because he had none to bring.

(*a*) Ejus Ego quidem Diligentiam in nonnullis, Judicium in multis requiro. *Animadv. p.* 375.

Indeed, as he quotes No-body for this account of the Age of *Thericles*, so he speaks of it himself with distrust. Dr *Bentley*, 'tis true, in his Translation, has put him into the *Positive Style*; and made him roundly affirm, that the Cup *WAS* invented by *Thericles*, a *Corinthian* Potter, in *Aristophanes*'s time: but *Athenæus* expresses himself with greater Reserve. His Words are *, *One* Thericles, *a* Corinthian *Potter* [*who lived about the Time of* Aristophanes *the Comœdian*] *IS SAID*, or *IS REPORTED to have made this Sort of Cup*: and *FAMA EST à Corinthio Figulo* Thericle *factos*, says the *Honest Latin Translator*. Which manner of speaking is the more to be observ'd, because it appears from sev-

* κατεσκευάσθαι δὲ λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεὺς, γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη. P. 470.

ral Paſſages in him, before and after this, that He himſelf was not ſatisfied of the Truth of this *Report*: for he immediately gives us ſome other accounts of the Original of the Word *, without the leaſt Intimation which he prefers. I allow, that theſe Derivations are forc'd ones, and to be given up: for that the Name of the Cnp came from the Name of a Man, is not to be doubted, I think; at leaſt, it was not to be doubted, till Dr *Bentley* attempted to prove it. Let us ſtep out of our way ſo far, as to hear his Extraordinary Argument. *Does not Common Analogy ſhew*, ſays he, *that as from* Ἡρακλῆς *comes* Ἡράκλειος, *and as from* Σοφοκλῆς *comes* Σοφόκλειος; *ſo from* Θηρικλῆς † (not only *may*, but) *MUST come* Θηρίκλειος †? Wonderful! Who would have thought that ſuch Certain Concluſions could be built on the Rules of Analogy? or that there was ſo near an Affinity between Logic and Grammar? Let us try it in another Inſtance: as from Ἀπιλλῆς comes Ἀπίλλειος, ſo from Θαλῆς the Philoſopher *muſt* come θάλειος *Virens*: Here is the ſame Analogy, and yet the Inference from it is ſtark naught. The Dr then was too raſh in aſſerting, that Θηρίκλειος *muſt* come from Θηρικλῆς, by the Rule of Analogy: it *does* come from it, I grant; but *does* and *muſt* are very different Things. The Engliſh Rhime goes a Truer and Surer way to work;

* P. 471.

† P. 21.

As from Gooſe comes Goſlin,
So from Sir Poſ. comes Sir Poſlin.

But to return to our Serious and Weighty point; *Athenæus*, I ſay, propoſes ſome other Derivations of Θηρίκλειος beſide that from Θηρικλῆς; and tho' Dr *Bentley* and I are pretty well agreed, that they are frivolous ones, yet it does not appear any way, that *He* undervalu'd 'em; or determin'd which had the better claim to Θηρίκλειος, They, or *Thericles*, which is a Sign, I think, that He himſelf was not fully ſatisfied in the matter. And another Shrewd Sign it is, that but a few Lines before this famous Paſſage, he cites a Fragment from a Play of *Alexis*, where, as he interprets it (*a*), *Hercules* is brought in, drinking out of a *Thericlean* Cup: and this he does without taxing the Abſurdity of the Poet; which he could hardly have omitted to do, if he had believ'd the Invention no Older than *Ariſtophanes*: for, at this rate, the bringing *Hercules*, and a *Thericlean Cup* upon the Stage together, would have been as ridiculous, as if one of Our Dramatic Poets ſhould repreſent *William the Conqueror* drinking in *Dwight*'s *Ware*. *Alexis*, one would think, could not have committed ſuch an Abſurdity, who liv'd but Threeſcore Years after *Ariſtophanes*; at leaſt *Athenæus* could not have paſs'd it by uncenſur'd, if that *Report* about the Age of the *Thericlean* Cup had ſtuck with him.

(*a*) Καὶ μέντοι Ἄλεξις (ſays he) Θηρικλείῳ ποιεῖ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πίνοντα; *and does not* Alexis *introduce* Hercules *drinking out of a* Thericlean *Cup?* In the Paſſage from *Alexis*, as it now ſtands in *Athenæus*, *Thericles* is not mention'd: but 'tis plain *Athenæus* thought, from ſome Expreſſions in it, that this Cup might be intended; or elſe he would not have ask'd a Queſtion about it.

But

But that it did not, we have this further Reason to believe; that he quotes *Lynceus Samius*, in the 469th page, for a Passage, wherein this Cup is represented (not as a *Corinthian*, but) an *Athenian* Invention: for that, I think, is the Natural Construction of *Lynceus*'s words; which I shall produce, and leave the Reader to judge of them *.

* Lynceus Samius *is brought in by* Athenæus *saying, that the* Rhodians *did* (Ἡδυπότιδας ἀντιδημιουργήσασθαι πρὸς τὰς Ἀθήνησι Θηρικλείους) work a sort of Cup (*call'd* ἡδυπότιδες) in imitation of the *Thericlean* Cup, made at *Athens*. *This Expression of* Lynceus *was probably in his Epistle to* Diagoras *mention'd in another place of* Athenæus (*p.* 647.) *where* Lynceus *does* (ἐκ παραλλήλου τιθέναι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐξαιρέτως γινόμενα τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ) compare the finest *Athenian* Manufactures with those of *Rhodes*. *This implys, I think, that the* Thericlean *Cup was an* Athenian *Invention; at least, we have* Lynceus Samius's *word for it, no Contemptible Writer, and of pretty Early Date; as being the Scholar and Acquaintance of* Theophrastus. *I know the Words* (τὰς Ἀθήνησι Θηρικλείους) *are capable of another Sense; but it is a forc'd and unnatural one.*

Now if *Lynceus Samius*'s Testimony be receiv'd, there's an end of *Athenæus*'s *Report* about the *Corinthian Potter*. The Authors of that Report, whoever they were, might be as well out in the *Time*, as in the *Country* of *Thericles*: If he were no *Corinthian*, but an *Athenian*; he might possibly be no *Potter* neither, but an *Archon*, or some Great Man: and the *Thericlean* Cups (as the Ἀντιγονίδαι and Σελευκίδαι mention'd by *Plutarch* together with them †) might be call'd so from him, that *us'd* 'em first, and not from Him that *invented* 'em. Which their Size and Worth also would make us apt to believe: for *Athenæus* tells us, they were Extraordinary Large, and

† In Vitâ *P. Æmil.*

and of a Vaſt Price; and could therefore be the Purchaſe only of Great and Wealthy men, till the *Rhodians* found out a way of making 'em Slight and Cheap; and then they grew Commoner *: and therefore, I ſay, one would be ready to think that ſome Great Man who firſt us'd 'em, gave 'em their name; and not He that invented 'em. And if the moſt Learned Mr *Dodwell*'s Opinion about the Age of *Phalaris* take place, (whom I hear he brings down to the LXXth Olympiad) we have the mention of an *Archon* preſerv'd in *Diodorus*, who liv'd early enough to give the Name to theſe Cups: for he muſt be, by this account, above Thirty Years Older than *Phalaris* †.

* Athenæ. p. 469.

† *He was Archon in Olympiad the* 61ſt; *as before, Page the* 147th *of theſe Papers.*

But becauſe ſome of the Greek Comœdians, and from Them the General Stream of Later Writers mentioning *Thericles* as a Potter, directly oppoſe this account; therefore I will not pretend to build any thing upon it. Indeed I need it not, in order to diſparage the Authority of *Athenæus*: from what I have produc'd out of him, I think, it manifeſtly appears, that no Weight is to be laid upon what He ſays in the point, who talks ſo looſely and waveringly about it; who produces Opinions on one ſide, and Opinions on t'other; who takes up a Report, on Hearſay in one page, and contradicts it by a Subſtantial Teſtimony from an Approved Author, in another; and is all over Inconſiſtency, and Confuſion. A Witneſs that thus talks forwards and backwards, in a breath, ought to be ſet aſide by conſent of Both Parties; and leave

leave the Merits of the Cauſe to be decided by clearer Teſtimonies.

And now what becomes of the Pompous Character with which Dr *Bentley* introduces this Single Evidence? *One indeed, but as good as a Multitude!* I agree with the Dr, if he means a Multitude of ſuch Suborn'd Witneſſes as he has brought to blaſt the Credit of *Phalaris*; One good Honeſt Downright Witneſs were worth 'em all: but Such, I think, I have prov'd *Athenæus* not to be in the Preſent Debate. However, if after what has been offer'd, the Reader ſhould ſtill be inclin'd to believe this one Hearſay Witneſs, I deſire him to remember, that his Evidence lies within a Narrow Compaſs, and that he affects but One Epiſtle: So that ſhould That, where the *Thericlean Cup* is mention'd, prove Spurious, yet the other 147 may, to our Comfort, be Genuine ſtill. And this Conſideration I hope the Reader has carried along with him thro' all the *Particular Proofs*, that they touch only thoſe Particular Epiſtles from whence they are taken, but do not affect the whole Body of 'em; for a Paſſage, or Part of a Book may be Spurious, and yet the Book it ſelf not be Spurious: eſpecially when it is a Collection of Pieces, that have no Dependance upon one another, as *Epiſtles*, *Epigrams*, *Fables*; the Firſt Number of which may have been encreas'd by the Wantonneſs, or Vanity of Imitators in after-times, and yet the Book be Authentic in the main, and an Original ſtill.

There

There are some Other Important Controversies which Dr *Bentley* has occasionally handled in this Paragraph; as whether *Thericles* was a *Turner*, or a *Potter* *? whether *Bulls* and *Cows* may be properly call'd θῆρες, as well as *Lyons*, and *Tygers* †? But these things making neither for, nor against our Argument, I am not at leisure to dispute 'em with him: The Misfortune of it is, that the Great Variety of Reading which the Dr has produe'd on a very Trifling Head may perhaps mischief him in the opinion of an Intelligent Reader; and make him thought a Man, who, with Ill Judgment, employs most of his Time on those things that deserve it least. To take off those Suspicions, and to do his Character right, I assure the Reader, that he went no further for almost all the Learning he displays on this Article than his Dictionaries, and what One of those (*a*) referr'd him to, *Casaubon*'s Notes on *Athenæus*. However, since he was so much oblig'd to that Great Man, I wonder that Common Gratitude, and Common Sense should not hinder him from falling upon Him, as he does, at the very time he is transcribing Him. *Casaubon*, in a Passage of *Athenæus* relating to this Controversie, was willing to read πεύδοντα, instead of πένδοντα, and gave his Reason for it, that he found it so in the ancient Epitomizer of *Athenæus*: to which our Dissertator, with an Air of Superiority, replys, *One may be* CERTAIN

* Dis. p. 18. *This Great Point was started, solemnly argu'd, and determin'd by* Salmasius, *in his* Exercitations; *and from thence Dr* B. *has taken every word he has said upon it: tho' at the same time he says it in such a manner as if no body had said it before him.*

† Ibid. *p.* 20.

(*a*) *Hesych.* in voce Θηρίκλειος, and the Notes upon it.

TAIN *'twas a Fault* ONLY *in that Copy of him that* Casaubon *us'd*: *for* Eustathius, WHO APPEARS NEVER *to have seen the true* Athenæus, *but only that* Epitome, *read it in his Book* σπένδοντα, &c. * Which is said with an Equal Degree of Truth, Decency, and Reason. For, in the first place, it is certain that *Eustathius* had seen, and does sometimes quote *Athenæus* himself, tho' he generally goes no further than the *Epitome* of him: and therefore *Casaubon* says only of *Eustathius*, that he did (*a*) *OFTEN use the* Epitome, *without consulting* Athenæus *himself*; and that he did *NOT SELDOM make use of the Reading, which was in the* Excerpta, *neglecting that in the Text, which was Truer and Better*: And I'll tell the Reader One Reason among an hundred, why he should sooner in this case trust *Casaubon* than Dr *Bentley*; 'tis, that *Casaubon* had the *Excerpta* of *Athenæus* entire, and could compare 'em therefore with *Athenæus* himself, and with *Eustathius*: whereas Dr *Bentley* will not pretend, I suppose, ever to have seen the *Excerpta*; for they are unprinted (*b*) to this day: and when therefore he pronounces it to be apparent, that *Eustathius* never saw the true *Athenæus*, he talks of a thing that he knows nothing of, and can in all probability know nothing of, but from *Casaubon*; and yet ventures to contradict him. Had I not reason to make the Itch of opposing Great Names upon very slight or no Grounds, a Chief and Distinguishing Mark of Pedantry? But

(*a*) SÆPE uti Epitome, integro *Athenæi* Codice neglecto--NON RARO sequi lectionem quæ in Excerptis, spretâ eâ quæ in Contextu longè interdùm melior ac verior. Animad. *p.* 2.

(*b*) *All, but so much of 'em as supplys the Room of what we have lost of* Athenæus *himself.*

But what if *Eustathius* had seen only the Epitome of *Athenaeus*? and His Copy of the Epitome had differ'd from *Casaubon*'s? does it follow, that all the Rest did so too? This is our Critic's sdmirable Inference; because in *Eustathius*'s Copy 'twas σπένδοντα, and not σπεύδοντα, therefore one may be certain it was so in *all* the Copies, but that which *Casaubon* us'd. I can easily bear his Contempt of Me and my Knowledge, when I find him opposing one of the Greatest Men that ever the Commonwealth of Learning produc'd, without so much as the Shadow of an argument to back him in it.

The Reader, I hope, will pardon me, if I wander a moment or two from my Subject, to give him a Like Instance of the Unreasonable Freedom Dr *Bentley* takes in reprehending Learned Men, even where there is no manner of Ground for it. In his Epistle to Dr *Mill* †, upon mentioning an *Anapastic* Verse of *Grotius*, [*Prisca domos dedit Indigena*] he takes occasion to reprove *Him*, and with Him, *Joseph Scaliger*, and *All the Moderns*, that have written in this sort of Verse, for not knowing the True Measure of it; which, he says, will never admit of a *Trochee*, or a *Tribrach* in the End of it, but when there is some kind of Stop and Rest there: and for this reason *Seneca* the Tragœdian, he assures us, has not imploy'd a Trochee in that place above *once or twice* throughout all his Plays, and then only when there was a *Full Close* of the Sense: and concludes, that if *Scaliger*, *Grotius*, and the Rest had liv'd in *Athens*, or *Old Rome*, and taken this Liberty in their Plays, they

† *At the End of* Malala.

they would have been hiss'd off the Stage with Infamy for it (*a*). One would think that Dr *Bentley*, with all his Stock of Self-sufficiency, could not have allow'd himself to use such insulting Language towards such Eminent Men, but when he was perfectly sure of his point: and yet nothing can be falser and fuller of mistake than what he has here asserted. It is Usual among the Greek Tragœdians to end their Anapæstic Verses with a Trochee or a Tribrach, even where there is *No Pause*; of which I will give him several Instances out of One Play of *Æschylus* (*b*): and *Seneca* is so far from having done this not above *once or twice*, and where there was a *full Close* of the Sense, that I believe he has done it at least forty or fifty times, where there is either no Close at all, or none beyond a Comma. I shall give the Dr as many Instances out of *Seneca* *, as I have done

(*a*) *Tribrachys* est Loco *Anapæsti*: quod vitium commune est *Grotio* cum *Jos. Scaligero, Flor. Christiano*, Aliisq; opinor Omnibus qui Sæculo hoc & superiore vel Tragœdias Græcas Latinè verterunt, vel ipsi scripserunt novas: quibus solenne est Anapæstos suos passim, ubi nulla Clausula est, nec interpunctum, Tribrachi, vel Trochæo, vel Cretico terminare. Næ isti, si olim stante Re Græcâ vel Romanâ suas Fabulas edidissent, Sibilis & κλωσμοῖς è Scenâ explosi fuissent. *p.* 26. Quin & *Seneca* Tragicus, ut scias eum de Industriâ temperavisse, *semel tantum atque iterum* Trochæo Anapæstos clausit, *nec nisi finitâ sententiâ*: qui scilicet Parœmiaco Locus esset, nisi is Scriptor, nescio cur, versum illum repudiâsset. *Ibid.*

(*b*) . . . . . ὁπόσοι
Τὴν Διὸς αὐλὴν εἰσοιχνεῦσι Πρ. Δε-
Διὰ τὴν λίαν φιλότητα βροτῶν. *V.* 122
Νῶθ' αἰθέριον κίνυγμ' ὁ τάλας
Ἐχθροῖς ἐπίχαρτα πέπονθα. *V.* 156.
Εἰς ἀρθμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότητα
Σπούδων — *V.* 191.
Τὸν δὲ χαλινεῖς ἐν πεσρίνοισι
Χειμαζόμενον — *V.* 565.
— στρόμβοι δὲ κόνιν
Εἰλίσσουσι — *V.* 1084.

* Trucibus monstris stetit imposita
Pelion Ossa — *Agam. V.* 337.
— Spargeret astra
Nubesq; ipsas. Med. *V.* 334.
Nos Cadmæis Orgia ferre
Tecum solitæ. Oet. *V.* 594.
Nec Parrhasiâ lentior arce
Sævâ cessit —— Oet. *V.* 1282.
—— Nunc Corybantes
Arma Ideâ quassata manu.
Oet. *V.* 1877.

done out of *Æſchylus*; and then ask him, how he durſt oppoſe men of *Grotius* and *Scaliger*'s Character, with ſuch groundleſs Aſſertions, as it was in every-body's power to diſprove, that did but caſt their Eye on *Seneca*, and the Greek Tragœdians?

But to return to our Buſineſs ——— I have now examin'd, I think, all that is material in Dr *Bentley*'s Objection about the *Thericlean Cups*, as far as the Authority of the Letters is concern'd in it: his Exception againſt My way of *Tranſlating* the Word ſhall not be forgotten in its proper place; when I come to conſider the Faults he has found with my Edition and Verſion.

This has, I confeſs, been a Long Article, but the next will make us amends; for I can hardly perſwade my ſelf to ſay any thing to it. He finds fault with the Letters for making *Phalaris*, in his Addreſs to *Pythagoras*, call his Doctrine *Philoſophy*; and Him, in another place, *Philoſopher* *: why? becauſe Pythagoras *himſelf invented theſe words* *. Could *Phalaris* therefore pay him a greater Compliment, than by uſing 'em? Queen *Elizabeth* firſt coin'd the Word *Fœminilis* in a Speech of Hers, as I remember, to One of the Univerſities; could that Body have ſhow'd her an handſomer piece of reſpect, than by uſing that very Word to Her afterwards as freely, as if it had been of the beſt Age of Latin? *Pythagoras* affected to be call'd *Philoſopher*, and fram'd the Term to that very End and Purpoſe: Would Dr *Bentley* have had *Phalaris*, when he deſign'd him

* Diſſer. *p.* 38.

him an Honour, rob him of the Title he was moſt fond of? He knew better how to Pleaſe the Man he was to Profit by: as little Good Nature as he had left, yet he had ſome Civility, and a great deal of Senſe; and, by the help of theſe, eſcap'd that Abſurd Management, which Dr *Bentley*, I find, had he been adviſ'd with, would have put him upon.

But *how came the Fame of ſo ſmall a Buſineſs* [as *Pythagoras*'s aſſuming this Name] *to reach* Phalaris's *Ear?* He may as well ask, how he came to hear his Name was *Pythagoras?* Fame, that told him the One, muſt tell him the Other too, after once *Pythagoras* had ſet up his Pretenſions; and I deſire Dr *Bentley* to prove that our Letter-writer nam'd him ſo before: and till he does That, the Epiſtles are ſafe from any Harm that This ſmall Objection can do 'em.

Before I go further, I muſt obſerve to the Reader an Inſtance of Dr *Bentley*'s great Goodneſs, which deſerves to be taken notice of: *I could ſhew* (ſays he) *from a whole Crowd of Authors, that* Pythagoras *firſt invented the word: but I content my ſelf with Two.* To content himſelf with Two Quotations, when he could produce ſo Many; and that upon ſo Clear and Manifeſt a point, that he need not have produc'd Any, (in which Caſes He is uſually moſt Liberal of his Learning) is no Common Favour; and I ought therefore (as I do) thankfully to own it. It almoſt tempts me to drop a Queſtion or two that I had to ask him here; as, what he means by ſaying,

that Pythagoras *first nam'd Philosophy?* whether, that he first nam'd That Philosophy, which before was call'd Wisdom? and why, if he meant so, he did not say so (*a*)? And what again he would be at, when he tells us, that *Pythagoras invented* the word *first?* and who it was that Invented it *Last?* Something too I had to say to him about *Nurses* talking *Philosophy* (*b*): But he has been very merciful in this Paragraph; and I forgive in my Turn.

(*a*) Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, *says* Laertius, *whom he translates; but it follows presently*, θᾶττον δὲ ἐναλεῖτο Σοφία: *which makes the Expression not so improper in* Laertius's *Greek, as Dr* Bentley's *English.*

(*b*) Dissert. *p.* 39.

There is still behind One Exception to the Credit of the Epistles, taken from the Names of some Tragœdians, there, and no where else to be found; and from the Age and *Date of Tragœdy* it self. The Section in which this Argument is manag'd is a short one, but very fruitful in Mistakes, and those of the First Rate; for which reason, and because it is the Last trouble of the kind I am likely to give the Reader, I shall insist upon it somewhat largely.

Aristolochus and *Lysinus*, he says, are *Two Tragic Poets that No-body ever heard of* *; and in another place, with great Humor, he calls 'em *Two Fairy Tragœdians* †: tho' methinks One of 'em at least seems not to be of the Race of those Little Beings; one would guess *Aristolochus*, by his Name, to be rather a *Gyant* than a *Fairy*. But to let that pass, —

* P. 39.

† P. 120.

Is

Is he ſure, that Neither of theſe Poets can be trac'd in Old Writers? what does he think of the *Numerus Ariſtolochius* (*a*) in the Nameleſs Piece uſually printed with *Cenſorinus*? does it not come from *Ariſtolochus*, a Poet; as the *Numerus Ariſtophanius* in the ſame Chapter does from *Ariſtophanes*? But becauſe the MSS differ in this paſſage, I will not inſiſt upon it. I will allow him, for the preſent, that No-body ever heard of either of theſe Tragœdians but in *Phalaris*; and I will give him a good reaſon for it: neither their Works, nor their Names were worth preſerving. *Phalaris* has drawn their Characters in ſhort; the One of 'em he calls *a very fooliſh Fellow* (*b*), and the other *a Sorry Poet, and an Impotent Adverſary* (*c*): and the Writings of ſuch Men can never laſt; nor even their Names, but by the Help of better Writers: and by the way therefore I would adviſe Dr. *Bentley* not to be too Vain upon his Performances. *Bavius* and *Mævius* had a Scornful Verſe beſtow'd upon 'em by *Virgil*; and That it ſelf would have made 'em Scandalouſly-well known to Poſterity, tho' No one elſe ſhould ever have nam'd 'em. If Sir *William Temple* ſhould make ſuch a Slighting Mention of Dr *Bentley* in any of his Future Writings, *He* too will Live

(*a*) *In the Text, as it ſtands printed Now, 'tis* Archebolion: *upon which* Ludovicus Carrio *has this Note,* Vulgò *Ariſtolochium,* Membranæ *Ariſtodolium: ſo that Some Editions (from Some MSS, I ſuppoſe) have it* Ariſtolochium; *or if the Editors made this change without the authority of MSS, 'twas becauſe they knew more of this* Ariſtolochus *than I own I do.*

(*b*) ἀμαθέσατε Λυσῆς. Ep. 97.

(*c*) Κακὸς μὲν ποιητὴς, ἀναλκὴς δὲ ἀγωνιστής. Ep. 68.

by that means, and not otherwiſe. Will the Dr *expunge out of the Catalogue of Mankind* (as his Terrible Words are †) all Poets that have the Ill Luck to be mention'd but *Once* in Old Authors? I thought, as a Critic, and a Philologer, he would have had more Regard for an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. What, at this rate, will become of Poor *Xenocles* and *Pythangelus*? (Two Tragœdians, juſt of the ſame ſize with our Two Fairy ones) whom *Ariſtophanes* once mention'd with contempt, as *Phaleris* does Theſe; and Whom (at leaſt the Firſt of 'em) Dr *Bentley* will be hard put to't to find mention'd by any-body beſides him. But not having conſider'd This Piece of Hiſtory ſufficiently, I will not be poſitive in it: there is Another, in which I have ſomewhat better Grounds to go upon; in the Inſtance of *Chlonthachonthlus*. He was no Poet indeed, but pretty near akin to one; a Lymaker by Profeſſion, and a famous Miſrepreſenter. Perhaps the Dr has never heard of him to this day; and perhaps he'll know as little of him two or three Years hence, as he does now: and yet I aſſure him, He's to be met with in a Celebrated Greek Author, in Whom he lies buried, and unknown to many of the Great Lights of the Commonwealth of Learning, becauſe that Good Author has the Misfortune to be put out without a Good *Index*. Now I'll undertake to trace *Ariſtolochus*, or *Lyſinus*, as ſoon as Dr *Bentley* ſhall *Chlonthachonthlus*: and when he lights upon him, he'll find, that the Author, where he is, is confeſſedly Genuine, notwithſtanding he

† Diſſert. p. 118.

men-

mentions this unheard-of Monſter of a Man, whom no-body ever mention'd ſince or before him.

But Dr *Bentley* has a better Objection than the Silence of Authors againſt theſe Tragœdians; he ſays, they could not have a being in *Phalaris*'s time, becauſe there was then no ſuch thing as *Tragœdy* it ſelf: *neither the Word nor Thing being known, while* Phalaris *tyranniz'd at* Agrigentum. *But* Theſpis *was the firſt Inventor of it, who acted his Firſt Tragœdy twelve Years after the Death of* Phalaris: and both *the Name* and the *Thing* were then (and not till then) *born together* *. In Oppoſition to this, I ſhall endeavour to make out theſe Three things: firſt, that, granting *Theſpis* to have been the Inventor of Tragœdy, yet he found it out early enough for *Phalaris* to have the uſe of the Word from him: in the next place, that Tragœdy was much Older than *Theſpis*; and that He was only the Improver, but not the Inventor of it: and yet further, that the *Word* Tragœdy was more ancient than the *Thing*, which we now underſtand by it. I think theſe Three Points to be clear beyond diſpute: if the Reader, after I have produc'd my Proofs, thinks ſo too, he will, I ſuppoſe, have a leſs Opinion of Dr *Bentley*'s Learning and Modeſty than even he has already, and be ſomething nearer toward thinking theſe Epiſtles Genuine.

* Diſſert. p. 90.

Let us ſuppoſe for the preſent, that *Theſpis* was the Inventer, (or as Dr *Bentley* Emphatically ſpeaks) *the Firſt Inventer* of Tragœdy;

'tis plain, *Phalaris* might have the uſe of the word from him. That *Theſpis* was Cotemporary with *Solon*, *Plutarch* (*a*), and *Diogenes Laertius* (*b*) expreſly affirm; telling us very particularly what paſs'd between *Solon* and *Theſpis*, in relation to the Plays of the Latter. And this account of *Theſpis*'s age Our Diſſertator himſelf, in his Soft Epiſtle to Dr *Mill* (*c*) allows. Now *Solon* was *Archon* Olympiad XLVI. 3 (*d*); *Phalaris* began his Reign Ol. LIII. 3, and ended it Ol. LVII. 3, according to the account which Dr *Bentley* (*e*) allows. So that between the Beginning of *Solon*'s and the End of *Phalaris*'s Government there are full 44 Years: Time enough in Conſcience, for the Word *Tragœdy* to come from *Athens* to *Agrigent*! And *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon* allows near as much Room for it, placing the Riſe of Tragœdy at the 47th Olympiad, a little after *Solon*'s Archonſhip. But to take our account at the very loweſt; let us ſuppoſe that *Theſpis*'s firſt Plays were thoſe that *Solon* ſaw, towards the Latter End of his Life: *Solon* dy'd at the end of the LIII^{d}, or the beginning of the LIVth Olympiad, according to the account which *Plutarch* eſpouſes (*f*); that is, a Year or two after *Phalaris* took the Tyranny upon him. Take Two or Three Years before *Solon*'s death, when *Theſpis* is ſuppos'd by this Low account firſt to have written; and from thence to the End of *Phalaris*'s Reign, there is a ſpace of about 17 Years,

(*a*) *Vit. Solon.*
(*b*) *In Solone.*
(*c*) *Neque* Theſpis *eâ quâ rentur tempeſtate vixit; nam* Solonis *æqualis fuit.* P. 46.
(*d*) *Soſicrates*, quoted by *Diogenes Laertius* in *Solon.* *Euſebius*, in his Chronicon, puts it a Year latet.
(*e*) Diſſert. *p.* 15.
(*f*) *Vit. Solon.*

Years, for *Phalaris* to hear of *Theſpis*'s Tragœdies: for it does not appear, but that thoſe Letters, where the Word τετραλογία occurrs, might have been written at the very End of his Tyranny. However, let 'em have been written in the middle, or at the very beginning of it, yet ſtill there will be time enough for *Phalaris* to learn this new word in. That *Piſiſtratus* ſeiz'd the Government of *Athens* ſome Years before *Solon*'s death, Dr *Bentley*, I dare ſay, will grant me: that he was turn'd out in, or rather before *Phalaris*'s Reign, he will not, I hope, deny me; becauſe he has own'd it in Terms, *p.* 41, of his Diſſertation. Allowing then that *Solon* and *Theſpis* were Cotemporary, there can be no doubt, whether *Phalaris* might hear of *Theſpis*'s Tragœdies.

All that can ſtartle us in the caſe is the Authority of the *Arundel Marble*, which ſeems to fix the acting of *Alceſtis*, one of *Theſpis*'s Plays, about the 60th Olympiad. But that all the *Æra*'s of that Marble are not rightly adjuſted, is certain, and Learned Men have prov'd beyond diſpute: and if there be miſtakes in it, why may not this be one of 'em? when what is ſaid there is contradicted by ſuch an Univerſal Concurrence of almoſt all the Hiſtory of thoſe times, which we have left? Dr *Bentley*, I am ſure, ought not to inſiſt on the Authority of the Marble in this caſe, becauſe He himſelf has quitted it in an Inſtance of the like Nature. *The* Arundelian *Marble indeed* (ſays he) *differs from all theſe in the periods of* Gelo *and* Hiero; *which would*

quite confound all this argumentation from Notes of Time. But either that Chronologer is quite out; or we can ſafely believe nothing in Hiſtory. Diſſert. *p.* 85. The Miſtake of the Marble may be in putting *Theſpis*'s name inſtead of *Phrynicus* his Scholar: and *Alceſtis*, the name of the Play, would make one think ſo, which *Suidas* expreſly mentions as one of *Phrynicus*'s; but is no where, that I can find, reckon'd among *Theſpis*'s. And ſuch a Miſtake might eaſily, I ſuppoſe, ariſe from the Negligence of the Graver, who, when he had gone as far as ἀφ' ἧς Θέσπις ὁ Ποιητὴς, might throw his Eye upon a Lower Line, where there was an account of *Phrynicus*'s Age; and finding the Word Ποιητὴς there exactly in the ſame Situation, might think himſelf right, and go on with the reſt that follow'd it: which is a Caſe that is known often to have happen'd in the copying of MSS; and may the rather be ſuppos'd to have happen'd here, becauſe the next *Æra* in the Marble falls as low as Olympiad 67; before which time it is not to be doubted but the *Alceſtis* of *Phrynicus* (that *Phrynicus*, who was *Theſpis*'s Scholar) was acted.

But, without the help of this Conjecture, and without laying aſide the Authority of the Marble; what is ſaid there may poſſibly be true, and yet *Plutarch*'s and *Laertius*'s accounts be true too, and the Epiſtles Genuine. For ſome of *Theſpis*'s Plays might be acted in *Solon*'s time, that is, about the 53d Olympiad; and yet his *Alceſtis* be ſhown not till about the 60th: which being a Play writ-

ten

ten after great Experience, and when he was in his Matureſt Judgment, might be the Beſt of his Works, for ought I, or Dr *Bentley*, can tell, and That by which he carried the Prize from his Rivals; and the fitteſt therefore to be taken notice of to Poſterity. The Dr indeed ſays, it was his *Firſt*; and ſays it in ſuch a manner, as if the Marble had ſaid it before him: but that is only according to his Uſual Way of putting Hiſtory upon us. All the Inconvenience that ariſes from hence, is, that *Theſpis* muſt then be ſuppos'd to have written Plays at the diſtance of at leaſt Seven whole Olympiads: and what if he be? there was yet a greater diſtance between *Ariſtophanes*'s Firſt and his Laſt Play; even the Interval of Nine entire Olympiads, or 36 Year. And I believe, 'tis much about the ſame time, ſince Mr *Dryden* wrote his Firſt Play; and the World has lately had a very convincing Inſtance, that he is not yet diſabl'd. Should Dr *Bentley* pretend 'tis improbable, that if *Alceſtis* were *Theſpis*'s *Beſt* Play, it ſhould not be mention'd by *Suidas*; my anſwer is, that I think it is as improbable, that *Suidas* ſhould not mention it, if it were his *Firſt*: and therefore I have told him my Opinion before, that it was neither his Firſt, nor Laſt; but *Phrynicus*'s Play erroneouſly apply'd to him by the Marble-Graver.

I have not mention'd *Suidas*'s Teſtimony about the Age of *Theſpis*, becauſe I think it of no manner of Conſequence; he being ſo often and ſo egregiouſly out in things of this nature, by the faultineſs of the MSS we now have

have of him, or the Errors of thoſe Authors which he at a venture tranſcribes. I confeſs, as he ſtands now, he ſeems to bring *Theſpis* ſomewhat lower than even the Marble may be ſuppos'd to do; for he ſays, he flouriſh'd ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ξ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, in the 61ſt Olympiad: but 'tis obſervable, that the Decads in this Number are not expreſs'd by a Word, but a Numeral Letter, which is more liable to alteration; and a ξ therefore might eaſily creep into the place of a N: the reſtoring of which would make his account conſiſtent with better Authorities (*a*). However that may be, Dr *Bentley* muſt remember, that He himſelf has produc'd (*b*) this account in his Letter after *Malala*, as Conſiſtent with *Plutarch*'s Story, which makes *Theſpis* contemporary with *Solon*; and is oblig'd therefore to reconcile the One with the Other, as much as I am: and he muſt remember too, that *Suidas* in the ſame place tells us, that *Theſpis* was the Sixteenth Tragœdian from *Epigenes Sicyonius*; and if he admits This part of his account, he'l loſe as much by it, as he gains by the Other.

(*a*) *Itaque, ut rectè monuit* Meurſius *in* Solone, *graviter errat* Suidas, *qui in* Θέσπ, *Olymp.* 61, *eum fabulas primùm docuiſſe ſcribit.* Menag. Comm. in Solon.

(*b*) P. 46.

For whether *Theſpis* was as ancient as *Solon* it matters not much, if *Tragœdy* was yet more ancient than He: and that it was ſo, there are ſuch Plain and Pregnant Teſtimonies as are not to be withſtood. *Plato*'s words on this occaſion are very remarkable and full. *Tragœdy*, ſays he, *is of ancient Uſage in this Country, nor did it take its Riſe from* Theſpis

and

and Phrynichus, *as Some Imagine* (it seems, for Dr *Bentley*'s comfort, there were Men Ignorant enough, even in *Plato*'s Time, to think so) *but if You consider the thing well, You will find, that it is extremely ancient* (*a*): and the Reason of his introducing this Reflection shews, that he thought it almost as ancient as *Minos*. I was aware of this Objection from the Date of Tragœdy, when I put out *Phalaris*; and thought therefore that I had prevented it by a short Note on the 97th Epistle, where I referr'd the Reader to this Passage in *Plato*. Dr *Bentley*, who has made so free an use of many Hints in my Book, *against Phalaris*, should not in Justice have over-look'd this Note, which made so strongly *for* him: but I find he has the Secret of seeing nothing in an Author, but what serves to countenance his Own Opinions.

(*a*) Ἡ δὲ Τραγῳδία ἐστὶ παλαιὸν ἐνθάδε, οὐκ, ὡς οἴονται, ἀπὸ Θέσπιδος ἀρξαμένη, οὐδ' ἀπὸ Φρυνίχου: ἀλλ', εἰ θέλεις ἐννοῆσαι, πάνυ παλαιὸν αὐτὸ εὑρήσεις, &c.

Plato in Minoe.

Plato's Testimony needs no Support with any man that justly esteems him; which for fear Dr *Bentley* should not, I will produce another Witness, whose Character and Works, I believe, are better known to him: It is *Diogenes Laertius*; who in the Life of *Plato* has these Words, *ANTIENTLY* (says he) *the Chorus did alone sustain the Tragœdy*; *AFTERWARDS* Thespis *found out One Actor, and gave the Chorus time to breathe* (*b*): to whom

(*b*) Τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῇ Τραγῳδίᾳ πρότερον μὲν μόνος ὁ χορὸς διεδραμάτιζεν, ὕστερον δὲ Θέσπις ἕνα ὑποκριτὴν ἐξεῦρεν, ἵνα τὸν ἀναπαύεσθαι τὸν χορὸν &c.

Æschy-

Æſchylus, he tells us, added a Second; and *Sophocles*, a Third. So that Tragœdy, according to His Opinion too, was more ancient than *Theſpis*; and He only an Improver of it.

Laertius's account falls in exactly with what *Ariſtotle* has ſaid on the ſame Subject, as far as *Ariſtotle* goes; only it is more particular and full. *Ariſtotle* *, reckoning up the Gradual Advances that had been made towards the perfection of Tragœdy, after its Firſt Eſtabliſhment, tells us, juſt as *Laertius* does, that *Æſchylus* improv'd it mightily, by bringing a Second Actor on the Stage; and that *Sophocles* perfected it by the addition of a Third. *Theſpis*'s Invention of a Firſt Actor is here imply'd alſo, tho' it be not expreſs'd: and indeed it was not to *Ariſtotle*'s purpoſe to mention it, when he was conſidering the Improvements of Tragœdy, as an Artificial Poem, which had a *Fable*, and an Action diſtinct from that of the Chorus; that is indeed, as it came out of the Hands of *Theſpis*, who in this reſpect muſt be own'd to have been the Founder rather than the Improver of it. The not conſidering theſe Two different States and Conditions of Tragœdy is what has bred great Confuſion in the Writings of the Criticks, and led Dr *Bentley* into all his Numerous Errors in this point. If he will ſuffer himſelf to be taught by ſo Inconſiderable a Writer as I am, I will endeavour to ſet him right, and to give him a clearer Account of it.

* *In his* Poetry.

Tra-

Tragœdy at firſt was nothing but an Hymn to the honour of *Bacchus*, ſung by a Number of Peaſants, after their Vintage was over, whilſt the Goat lay bleeding upon the Altar. The Company that perform'd this Sacred Song, either alternately, or altogether, as it happen'd, were what in Succeeding Times was call'd the *Chorus*; in which therefore it muſt be remember'd that the Foundation of Tragœdy was laid. Afterwards the Subject of Tragœdy was much alter'd and vary'd: for the Compoſers of thoſe Songs together with the Praiſes of *Bacchus* joyn'd the Encomiums of Great and Famous Perſons, and Satyrical Reproofs † alſo of the Vitious Men, and Manners of their Times. But ſtill All this was perform'd by the *Chorus*; and (as *Laertius* obſerves) continu'd ſo to be till *Theſpis*'s time. He, to pleaſe the Audience, and relieve the Chorus, brought a ſingle Actor upon the Stage; who, at fit Intervals, came out from the Reſt, and imitated the Actions of ſome Illuſtrious Perſon, and retir'd agen, when the Chorus had taken breath; which was ſtill the moſt Conſiderable Part of the Entertainment. However by this Invention a new Turn was given to Tragœdy, the Buſineſs of the Chorus was leſſen'd, and part of it brought into the hands of a ſingle Actor, and ſomething like a *Plot*, or *Fable* was introduc'd. *Æſchylus* improv'd upon this Model, and grew ſtill more upon the Chorus, by adding a Second * Actor, and diverſifying the Fable; and *Sophocles* at laſt compleated the Poem, by the addition of a Third

† Ibid.

* Æſchylus *employ'd ſometimes a Third Actor too, but rarely.*

Third. And by this time the Chorus, which was at firſt Eſſential to Tragœdy, and did all in it, was grown only an Acceſſory Ornament of it; and employ'd to relieve the Actors in the ſame manner that the Actors were at firſt found out to relieve That. Nay, to ſee the fate of things, the Chorus, which was anciently the Play it ſelf, now ſerv'd chiefly to repreſent the Spectators, and to ſuggeſt ſuch Reflections as They, obſerving what paſs'd upon the Stage, might be ſuppos'd to make.

Tragœdy being now a thing ſo very different from what it was before, and *Theſpis* having made the firſt Step towards this great Change, it is no Wonder that he ſhould be call'd ſometimes the Author of it; that is, the Author of that Sort of Tragœdy, which conſiſted in Imitation, and a Fable, excluſive to the Neceſſity of a Chorus; and which had now, among the Men of Art, who ſpake nicely, and reaſon'd ſubtilly about things, almoſt engroſs'd the Name. I ſay, excluſive of the Neceſſity of a Chorus: for tho', in remembrance of the firſt Riſe of Tragœdy, and in complyance with the Ceremonies of Religion, the Chorus was ſtill retain'd; yet it came in only by the bye as it were, and the Action, upon which the Play turn'd, was Entire and Perfect without it.

What was ſaid of Tragœdy then in the Second and more Confin'd Senſe of the word, Dr *Bentley* in his great Wiſdom and Learning took as ſaid of it at large; and pronounc'd at a venture that there was no ſuch Thing as Tragœdy before *Theſpis*'s time, becauſe there was

was no ſuch thing as that Sort of Tragœdy which *Theſpis* invented: which is as if I ſhould ſay, the *Italians* firſt found out *Opera's*, a Baſtard Sort of Tragœdy, in theſe Latter Days; and therefore the *Italians* firſt found out Tragœdy. There is no difference in the caſe but this, that what the *Italians* did was a Debaſement of Tragœdy, whereas *Theſpis*'s Invention was an Improvement of it: but ſtill Tragœdy it ſelf was equally before the Improvement of the One, and the Debaſement of the other.

Our Critic was not contented to make but One Miſtake on this Point; He has doubled it, by urging alſo a miſtaken Authority for it: for thoſe Verſes of *Horace*, which He, out of the Depth of his Reading, produces on this occaſion, are far from countenancing his Raſh Aſſertions. At firſt ſight indeed he might think they did; but a Second Thought (and ſuch Thoughts, one of his Greek Proverbs ſays, are the Beſt) would have inform'd him, that *Horace* had expreſs'd himſelf with the utmoſt Caution in this matter; and diſtinguiſh'd Critically between that Sort of Tragœdy, which was before *Theſpis*'s time, and That which *Theſpis* himſelf introduc'd.

Ignotum Tragicæ Genus inveniſſe Camenæ
Dicitur, & Plauſtris vexiſſe Poemata Theſpis.

It was *Ignotum Genus Tragicæ Camenæ*, an Unknown Kind of Tragic Poetry, which *Theſpis* found out; and that implys, I think, that there was Another Kind of Tragic Poetry in uſe before him. And that this is no New In-

Interpretation of the Words, made to ſerve a Turn, the Dr may be ſatisfied, if he pleaſes to conſult the Commentators on the place: they are not in Greek indeed, but they ſpeak as Good Senſe, as if they were; and ſome of the Beſt of 'em give this very account of it.

Upon this Bottom we can anſwer for all the unwary Expreſſions, that may have drop't at any time from the Pens of Old Writers, in relation to *Theſpis*; particularly for that Paſſage in *Plutarch* *, where he repreſents *Theſpis*, and thoſe of his time as ἀρχόμενοι κινεῖν τὴν τραγῳδίαν. What he means by that Ambiguous Phraſe, may be diſputed; whether it be not, that They firſt gave Life and Motion to Tragœdy, as they certainly did, by taking it in ſome meaſure out of the Hands of the Chorus, and making it an *Imitative*, or *Dramatic* Poem: but whatever he means, I think I have prov'd, that he could not mean, conſiſtently with Hiſtory, that there was no ſuch thing as Tragœdy of any kind before the days of *Theſpis*. I add, that neither could he mean this, and be conſiſtent with Himſelf: for he expreſly tells us in another place †, that the Acting of Tragœdies was One part of the Funeral Solemnities which the *Athenians* perform'd at the Tomb of *Theſeus*.

* *In the Life of* Solon.

† *In the Life of* Theſeus.

The Reader may remember a Reflection quoted from *Velleius Paterculus* towards the beginning of this Diſcourſe, where *Homer* is repreſented as the Author of Epic Poetry, and *Archilochus* of Iambicks, or the Epode: not that they were either of them ſo, ſtrictly ſpeaking; for *Ariſtotle* ſeems to ſay, that there were

were many Epic Poems before *Homer*, tho' they happen'd to be loſt; and that *Homer*'s *Margites* was written, interchangably in Heroic and Iambic Verſe, long before *Archilochus*. *Paterculus*'s meaning was, or ſhould have been, that they each of 'em brought the ſeveral Sorts of Poetry they practis'd, and which before them were rough and unfiniſh'd, to ſuch a degree of perfection, as that they juſtly deſerv'd to be call'd the Fathers of 'em. And in This Senſe it is that we muſt underſtand thoſe Authors, who make *Theſpis* the Inventer of Tragœdy; or allow, that they ſpake inconſiderately, and againſt the Clear Truth of Hiſtory. I queſtion not, but ſome Hundreds of Years hence, *Butler* will be thought the Author of *Engliſh Burleſque*; tho' there were many Little things written in that way, before His *Hudibras*: but He having ſo far outſtripp'd thoſe that wrote before him, and carried that Sort of Verſe up to ſuch a pitch of Excellence, will probably be eſteem'd and call'd the Inventer of it; and his Predeceſſors not be thought worth mentioning, or remembring.

Hephæſtion ſays this expreſly.

By this time I hope the Reader is ſatisfied, that Two of the Three points which Dr *Bentley* has advanc'd on this head, are altogether miſtaken; that, allowing *Theſpis* to have been the Author of Tragœdy, yet he might have invented it time enough for *Phalaris* to hear of it; and that *Theſpis* was not the firſt, but (to comply with the Dr's manner of ſpeaking) the *Second* Inventer of it. His Third Aſſertion is yet more extravagant, and further from all Colour of Truth, than either of

the former: it will be eaſie to confute it, if we can but underſtand it.

* P. 40. *Neither was the Name of Tragœdy* (ſays he *) *more ancient than the Thing* — What does he mean? *Names* I thought were invented to ſignifie *Things*; and that the Things themſelves therefore muſt be before the Names by which they are call'd: but he opens himſelf, — *as ſometimes it happens when an Old Word is borrow'd and apply'd to a New Notion.* Right! it ſometimes happens that a *Word* is Older than the *Thing* to which it is apply'd; but *Names* can never be before the Things they belong to. But to forgive him This want of Exactneſs, among a Thouſand; I agree perfectly with him, that the *Word* Tragœdy was not more ancient than the *Thing*; they were, as he ſays, *born together*, or at leaſt pretty near one-another: but for that very reaſon I inferr, that the *Word* Tragœdy was long before *Theſpis*, becauſe I have prov'd that the *Thing* it ſelf was: and he could not therefore favour my pretenſions more, than by allowing that they were *born together*. However, this Twin-Birth muſt be underſtood of Tragœdy in its firſt Infant State, as it took its riſe from the *Dithyrambicks* of *Bacchus*; for the Name of Tragœdy was undoubtedly more ancient than the Thing, that is *now*, or has generally been for Two thouſand Years underſtood by it. It cannot reaſonably be queſtion'd, but that thoſe *Bacchic Hymns* they ſung in Chorus round their Altars (from whence the Regular Tragœdy came) were call'd by this Name; the Etymology of the word ſhews that it belong'd to 'em; for whether it be deriv'd

tiv'd from τρύγη [*vindemia*] or from τράγος [*hircus*], joyn'd with ᾠδή in which the Grammarians are divided *) either way it very naturally expresses some of the Great Circumstances of that Solemnity: according to its First Derivation, it points out the *Time* of it, which was upon the Gathering in of their *Vintage* †; according to its Second, the *Sacrifice* it self, at the Offering of which these Odes were sung.

* *There is a Third Etymology of the word from* τρυξ, *the Lees of wine, and* ᾠδή: *but the Reason of it falls in with that of the first.*

† εὑρέθη κατ' αὐτὴν τῆς τρύγης κυρὸν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τρυγῳδία τὸ φωνὴν ἐκλήθη ἡ κωμῳδία. Exce. Athen. *p.* 40.

But as to This we are in the dark, and have only Probabilities to guide us; it may with more assurance be said, that under the word Tragœdy both Tragœdy and Comœdy were at first comprehended: which double Use of the Word continu'd also, after these Two Sorts of Dramatic Poetry were sufficiently distinguish'd; as we may learn from (*a*) *Athenæus*, from *Aristophanes*, and his *Scholiast* (*b*), and from *Hesychius* (*c*). If This be so, (*a*) ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τρυγῳδία &c. as above.

(*b*) In his Notes on this Verse in ΑΧΑΡΝΗΣ, *Act.* 2, *Sc.* 5. Μέλλων δεῖ τῆς πόλεως τρυγῳδίαν ποιῶν] Κωμῳδίαν. ἔτυι διὰ τρύγα ἐπῆλθον λαμβάνειν, τοῦτ' ὅτι νέον οἶνον· ἢ διὰ τὸ, μὼ ὄν τὰν φρονιτέων τὼι ἀρχῶι, τρυγὶ χρεύδω τὰς ὀλεις· And again in his Notes on this Verse in ΣΦΗΚΕΣ, —δεινὸς γνώμης, καὶ μείζον ἢ ὅσῃ τρυγῳδὸς] ἀντὶ τοῦ, μείζονος ἢ κατὰ τὴν Κωμῳδίαν &c. *p.* 476. And in the 12th book of *Athenæus*, c. 13, there is a Fragment of *Aristophanes*'s ΓΗΡΥΤΤΑΔΗΣ preserv'd, where Τραγῳδὸς signifies a *Camœdian*, —σφᾶς μὲν Σαννυρίων —Ἀπὸ τῆς Τραγῳδῶν· The same word Τρυγῳδία signifies Tragœdy properly so call'd, in this Passage of *Aristophanes*, αὐτὸς δ' ἐνδὺν ἀναβάδην ποιεῖ —Τρυγῳδίαν· (ΑΧΑΡΝ. *Act.* 2, *Sc.* 3.) for This is spoken of *Euripides*. Besides These, there are Two other Passages in the Prolegomena to *Aristophanes*: —τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ [*i.e.* κωμῳδίαν] καὶ τρυγῳδίαν φασὶ, διὰ τὸ, &c. Prol. ad Arist. δεῖ Κωμῳδ' —ἔστι δὲ παύτῳ ἐπῆν καὶ τραγῳδίαν, οἱονεὶ τρυγῳδίαν τινὰ οὖσ', ὅτι τρυγία χεώμενοι ἐκωμῴδουν· Ibid. (*c*) *Hesych.* in Voce τρυγῳδῶν·

and Comedy was more ancient than *Thespis*, as I have prov'd before (*a*) in these Papers; it is clear that the Word Tragœdy was before *Thespis* too. I will detain the Reader no longer upon so plain and known a point, and which I did not think any man, that had the least Skill in these matters, would have put me to the trouble of proving.

(*a*) P. 140, 141.

I have mention'd once or twice the Early Mixture of Satyr and Ridicule that crept into this Serious Poem; it certainly did so, and continu'd very long in it, even after Comœdy set up for a distinct sort; and it is to be thought, even to the days of *Thespis* himself, if not afterwards. His movable Stage, a Cart, was not probably free from that Scurrility and Buffoonery which were so usually utter'd from that place, that ἐξαμάξειν, and (*b*) ἐξ ἁμάξης λέγειν, became Proverbial Expressions for Satyr and Jeering. I desire this may be observ'd, because it gives us an easie and natural account of that expression in *Phalaris* [κατ' ἐμοῦ τράγῳδίας γράφειν] which Dr *Bentley* has made such hideous work with: for the meaning of that is no more than this, that they wrote *Lampoons*, or Satyrical Verses upon him; with which the Tragœdies before and about his time (I have said) were usually twisted. So that tho' *Phalaris could not be the argument of Tragœdy while he liv'd*, (as our Critic learnedly objects) yet he might be the argument of that Sort of Satyr which usually accompanied Tragœdy: and the Dr may perhaps, before he dies, have a convincing Proof, that a Man may

(*a*) Βοᾶς ῥητὰ καὶ ἀῤῥήτα ὀνομάζων ὥσπερ ἐξ ἁμάξης —— Demosth. contrà Æsch. § 37.

may be the Subject of ſuch Tragœdies, while he is Living.

And now, upon the whole, is not Dr *Bentley* a moſt Diſcreet Writer? who has choſen out ſuch an argument to prove *Phalaris* Spurious, as his beſt Friends would have pitch'd upon to prove him Genuine? for τραγῳδία in the days of *Phalaris* took into its ſignification ſomewhat of a *Lampoon*, or Abuſive Copy of Verſes, according to the Uſe of it in the Epiſtles: but it had nothing of that Senſe in the Sophiſt's time, let the Dr place him as high as he can.

I have nothing more to ſay to the Dr upon any of his Arguments againſt the Authority of *Phalaris*; I have conſider'd 'em All, with great Fairneſs, I am ſure; and, I fear, with more Exactneſs than they will be thought to deſerve. I will not follow his Pattern ſo far, as to ſhut up theſe Reflections by ſaying, that *I have had too much Regard to him in giving him the Honour and Patience of ſo long an Examination* *: the Regard I had was to my Self, and to thoſe Excellent Perſons, who were injur'd on my account; and, to do right to Them, averſe as I am to Employments of this nature, I could think no Trouble too great, no Task too mean.

* Diſſert. p. 55.

If I am capable of judging either of Dr *Bentley*'s Performances, or my Own, the Caſe ſtands thus between us: Of the *Five General Arguments* he has produc'd, the *Four firſt* are Evidently againſt him; neither *the Dialect*, nor *the Age of the Greek*, nor *the way of Counting by Talents*, nor *the Matter and Buſineſs of the Letters*, can in the leaſt ſhock a Conſidering

Reader; the Only Point that can possibly prejudice him, is that of their *Lying hid for a Thousand Years*: and how far I have taken off the Force of this Objection the World must judge.

Among his *Particular Proofs*, That which relates to *the Towns* is so involv'd in Obscurity, that I must own 'tis perfectly clear'd on neither Side: that *Three* of 'em, notwithstanding what He has said, may be as Old as *Phalaris*, I think I have made out; and for the *Fourth*, *Tauromenium*, I have shewn that the Single Author he depends upon gives Inconsistent Accounts of it: and should either of those accounts be admitted, I have further shewn, that the Epistles no where necessarily imply, that there was such a Town when They were written.

The *Proverbs and Expressions* found in Later Authors, are such Slight and Insignificant Objections, that 'tis no piece of Vanity to say, I have effectually remov'd 'em.

And as to his *Words of Art*; the First of 'em, about the *Thericlean Cups*, has indeed a Shew of Proof, but no Proof at the bottom; the Next, taken from the Term *Philosophy*, has not so much as the Shew of a Proof: and the Last, from *Tragedy*, is indeed a Proof, and a Good One; but it makes directly against him.

There are then in his Whole Dissertation but *Three Points*, that can be thought to affect the Epistles even by a Careless Reader; That of their *Lying hid for a Thousand Years*, that of *Tauromenium*, and that of *Theritles*: Of these the

the *Two Firſt* he borrow'd from Me (*a*), without acknowledging the Debt, or making the leaſt Improvement of Either; the *Laſt* he was probably ſo happy as to light upon in turning a Dictionary: all that Glitter of Quotations, with which he ſhines upon this Article, was drawn from Honeſt *Heſychius*, one of the great Storehouſes of his *Alphabetical* Learning.

(*a*) — *Sunt cur dubitem an* Phalaris *jure vendicet ſuas. Neq; enim facile poterant Literæ & à Viro tam inſigni ſcriptæ, & in ſuo genere abſolutæ*, ultra mille annos ignotæ penitus *latere* —

Quòd ſi vera refert Diodorus Siculus, Tauromenium, *ad cujus cives hic Auctor ſcribit, & conditam fuiſſe, & eo nomine donatam poſt Naxum à Dionyſio Juniore dirutam, actum eſt de* Phalaridis *Titulo, & ruit omnis male ſuſtentata Conjecturis Authoritas.* Præf. Phalar.

The only thing in his Piece, that is clearly made out, and may ſeem material, is his Proof of *Ocellus Lucanus*'s being Genuine: but 'tis ſuch an one, as proves at the ſame time, that *Phalaris* too may be Genuine, and deſtroys the force of all he has ſaid upon the Article of *the Dialect*; and is ſo far from being *New* and his *Own*, (as he has the Modeſty to pretend) that 'tis taken Word for Word out of an Author (*b*) that writ above fifty Years ago; the Scarcity of whoſe Book, and the Probability of not being trac'd, encourag'd him to ſet up for a Diſcoverer.

(*b*) *Virtanium.*

This is a Short and True Account of Dr *Bentley*'s Whole Performance: if he be of Opinion, that I have undervalu'd any of his *Arguments*, I am willing, Weary as I am, to try 'em upon *Another Subject*; to propoſe 'em in their Natural Light and Force, and ſee whether he will admit the Concluſion.

IF Dr *Bentley*'s Diſſertations ſhould outlive ſome Centuries, which I am far from thinking they will; and ſhould be read, which I am ſtill farther from ſuſpecting: and ſhould the Criticks of ſucceeding Ages ſtart an impertinent Diſpute, whether they be Genuine or not; I am of opinion as Strong and Concluding Arguments may be brought to prove 'em Spurious and falſly aſcrib'd to Dr *Bentley*, as any the Dr has us'd to ſhew the Letters now in Debate to be a Thouſand Years Later than *Phalaris*. They may carry the Dr's Name in the Front of 'em, as the Letters do that of the Tyrant; but Thoſe who examine 'em cloſely, and try 'em by the Rules of Criticiſm, which the Dr has here eſtabliſh'd, will eaſily Diſcover the Impoſture. For we will ſuppoſe, that after thoſe Papers have lain hid and neglected for ſome Ages, they may unluckily fall into the hands of a Critic, who has Leiſure and Ill Nature enough to trouble Himſelf and the World with a Nice Enquiry, whether they are Genuine, or not: I think he would, or might, in Dr *Bentley*'s Way and Manner, and for the moſt part in his very Words too, argue againſt their being truly His to whom they are aſcrib'd. * "The "Sophiſt, whoever he was, that wrote theſe "Looſe Diſſertations in the Name and Cha- "racter of Dr *Bentley*, (give me leave to "ſay this now which I ſhall prove by and "by) had not ſo bad an Hand at humoring "and perſonating, but that Some may be-

"lieve

* *The lines that have Comma's on the ſide are in Dr* Bentley's *own Language.*

" lieve it is the Librarian himſelf who talks " ſo big; and may not diſcover the Aſs un- " der the Skin of that Lyon (*a*) in Criticiſm and Philology. " But I ſhall examine Dr " *Bentley*'s Title to theſe Diſſertations, and " ſhall not go to diſpoſſeſs him by an Arbi- " trary Sentence in his own Dogmatical Way, " but proceed with him upon a Lawful Evi- " dence, and a fair Impartial Tryal. And I " am very much miſtaken in the Nature and " Force of my Proofs, if ever any man here- " after that reads them perſiſt in his Opi- " nion of making Dr *Bentley* the Author of " theſe Criticiſms (*b*).

(*a*) Differ. p. 11.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 13.

" Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting " this Impoſtor, yet his very *Speech* had be- " tray'd him, for it is neither that of a Scho- " lar, nor an Engliſhman; neither Greek, " Latin, nor Engliſh, but a Medley of all " Three: He had forgot that the Scene of " theſe Writings was *London*, where the En- " gliſh Tongue was generally ſpoken and " written; as, beſides other Teſtimonies, " the very thing ſpeaks it ſelf in the Re- " mains of *London* Authors, as the *Gazetts*, " the *Caſes* written by *London Divines*, and " others. How comes it to paſs then that " our Dr writes not in Engliſh, but in a Lan- " guage farther remov'd from the true En- " gliſh Idiom than the Doric Greek was from " the Attic (*c*)? Why does Dr *Bentley*, an Engliſhman, write a New Language, which no Engliſhman before ever wrote, or ſpoke? How comes his Speech neither to be that of the Learned, nor that of his Country? but a mix'd particolour'd Dialect, form'd out of both?

(*c*) Ibid. p. 40, 41.

both? "Pray, how came that Idiom to be
* Diſſert. p. 41. "the Court-language at St. *James's* *?
But ſhould we allow, that in ſome Paſt Age ſuch a Manner of Speech might have prevail'd among Engliſhmen; yet there will ſtill "lye another Indictment againſt the Credit "of theſe Diſſertations, on the account of "the Engliſh of the true Age of Dr *Bentley* "not being there repreſented; but a more "Recent Idiom and Style, that by the whole "Thread and Colour of it betrays it ſelf to "be written in an Age very diſtant from His. "Every Living Language, like the Perſpiring "Bodies of Living Creatures, is in perpetual "Motion and Alteration; which in Tract of "time makes as obſervable a Change in the "Air and Features of a Language, as Age "makes in the Lines and *Mien of a Face*. All "are ſenſible of this in their own Native "Tongues, where continual Uſe makes every "man a Critic: ſo that there is no Engliſh-"man but thinks himſelf able from the very "Turn and Faſhion of the Style to diſtin-"guiſh a freſh Compoſition from another a
† Diſſer. p. 57. "hundred Years old †. Now when we compare theſe Diſſertations with the Writings of Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, Biſhop *Sprat*, Sir *William Temple*, and Others, we find the Style of that Age had a quite different Turn and Faſhion from that of our Diſſertator. "Should I "affirm that I know the Novity of theſe Diſ-"ſertations from the whole Body and Form "of the Work; none perhaps would be con-"vinc'd by it, but thoſe that, without my "Indication, could diſcover it by themſelves. "I ſhall let that alone then, and point out

"only

" only a few Marks and Moles in 'em, " which every one that pleaſes may know " them by *. In the 14th page, the moſt *timid*; for which the Ancients would have ſaid, the moſt *doubtful*, or *ſcrupulous*: in the 46th, *Negoce*; for which they would have ſaid *Dealing*, *Commerce*, or *Intercourſe*: in the 47th, *repudiated their Vernacular Idiom*; for which they would have ſaid, *laid aſide their Mother-Tongue*: in the 16th page, a ſmall *Doſe* of Sagacity; for which they perhaps would have ſaid a ſmall *Share*: in the 59th, *Manufacture*, for the forging of a Story; never us'd by the Ancients in that Senſe, but always for the work of the *Hand*, not that of the *Brain*. They that will make the ſearch, may find more of this ſort, as *brittle Compliments* (*a*), *incurable Botches* (*b*), *broaching of expreſſions* (*c*), *lopping off branches of Evidence* (*d*), *a Scene of Putid Formality* (*e*); *Men ſpringing up like Muſhrooms out of Rotten Paſſages of Authors* (*f*), and many others of the ſame Strain: " but I ſup- " poſe theſe are ſufficient to unmask the Re- " cent Sophiſt under the Perſon of the Old " Librarian (*g*).

* Differt. p. 52.

(*a*) P. 22. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) P. 28. (*d*) P. 29. (*e*) P. 58. (*f*) P. 118. (*g*) P. 53.

But were it poſſible to produce an Author of the ſame Country and Age with Dr *Bentley*, who wrote in the Language of this Diſſertation, yet ſtill it is abſurd to think that one of his Education, Character, and Station ſhould be the Author of it. For Dr *Bentley* is known to have appertain'd to the Family of a Right Reverend Prelate, who was the Great Ornament of that Age; to have had an Univerſity-Education, and to have convers'd much in the City, and at Court; and with theſe

theſe advantages, he could not but be more refin'd than the Writer of this piece of Criticiſm; who by his manner of expreſſing himſelf ſhews, that he was taken up with quite other thoughts and different Images from thoſe that uſe to fill the Heads of ſuch as have had a Learned and Liberal Education. For this Sophiſt is a perfect *Dorian* in his Language, in his Thoughts, and in his Breeding. The familiar expreſſions, of *taking one tripping* (a), *coming off with a whole Skin* (b), *minding his hitts* (c), *a friend at a pinch* (d), *going to blows* (e), *ſetting horſes together* (f), and *going to pott* (g); with others borrow'd from the Sports and Employments of the Country, ſhew our Author to have been accuſtom'd to another ſort of Exerciſe, than that of the Schools.

(a) P. 27.
(b) P. 32.
(c) P. 34.
(d) P. 36.
(e) P. 57.
(f) P. 65.
(g) P. 63.

" Some Perſons perhaps may Gratuitouſly " undertake to Apologize for Dr *Bentley* a- " bout this matter of the Dialect *: they may plead in his behalf, that he was born in ſome Village remote from Town, and bread among the Peaſantry while Young; and for that reaſon " might ever after have a Twang of the " Country Dialect. Now if any one know " an Expreſs Teſtimony that he was bred in " the Country, he can teach me more than I " at preſent remember. This I know in ge- " neral † from *Anthony Wood*, and others, that many have come from the Employments of the Country to be Doctors in the Univerſity; " and ſo He may come in among the reſt. " But then muſt his Language be ever after- " wards Doric, becauſe he had once Footing " in a Country Town *? The ſame Author tells

* Diſſert. P. 43.

† P. 45.

* Ibid.

tells us of ſeveral born and bred in the Country, who yet in Proceſs of Time have learnt to ſpeak a different Dialect from that of their Mother-Village. "Why then muſt "Dr *Bentley*'s Dialect ſtill needs be Doric? "and that ſo tenaciouſly, that twenty Years "living in the Univerſities and City could "not at all alter it in one of that Education †? † P. 46.
He was part of that time a Library-keeper to a Learned Dean, and afterwards to His Majeſty; a Member of one Univerſity, and a Sojourner in the other; a Chaplain in Ordinary to the King, and a Tutor in extraordinary to a Young Gentleman: "and could not that "Perpetual Negoce and Converſe with Gentlemen and Scholars bring his Mouth by "degrees to ſpeak a little finer? Would "not he that aim'd at the Reputation of a "Polite Scholar, and for that reaſon had applyd himſelf in a particular manner to the "*belles Lettres*, have quitted his Old Country "Dialect, for that of a *Londoner*, a Gentleman, and a Scholar? and not by every "word he ſpake make the Ridiculous Diſcovery of his being a Perfect Stranger * to * P. 46.
all Polite Learning, and Gentleman-like Converſation?

"But let us hear a Second Apology that "may be made for the *Doriſm* of Dr *Bentley*: He may perhaps be defended from "the like Practiſe of others, who being *Londoners* born or bred, have repudiated the "Vernacular Idiom of the City for that of "the Country; as Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange* in his "*Æſop*'s Fables, Sir *John Suckling* in his *Ballad*, and Mr *Dryden* in his *Harveſt home*.

"So

" So that tho' Dr *Bentley* be ſuppos'd to be a
" Native of *London*, or bred Liberally, yet
" here is an Excuſe for his quitting the City
" Language. But I conceive, with ſubmiſſi-
" on, that this argument is built upon ſuch
" Inſtances as are quite aliene from the caſe
" of our Diſſertator. For Doric might in-
" deed be proper for Fables, or Ballads,
" where Brutes, or Peaſants are brought in
" ſpeaking; or for Scotch Songs, and the
" Chorus of a Comedy, on the account of
" the Doric Muſic: but it has not Grace and
" Majeſty enough for the Subject Dr *Bentley*
" is engag'd in. What affinity then is there
" between Dr *Bentley*'s caſe, and that of Wri-
" ters of Fables, Ballads, and Comedies?
" what mighty Motives can Here be for aſſu-
" ming a Foreign Dialect? His Pieces are
" dated in the midſt of *London*, directed to
" the very next Street, addreſs'd to a Scho-
" lar, about a Controverſie in Criticiſm, de-
" ſign'd for the view of men of Literature,
" and not written to expreſs the humor of
" the Country, or to entertain men of Low
" Rank and Character. If any will ſtill ex-
" cuſe the Dr for Dorizing in theſe Circum-
" ſtances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of
" being the humbleſt of his Admirers and
(a) Diſſer. p. 50, 51. " Vaſſals (*a*).

The ſame Apology that is made for the Doric way of ſpeaking, may perhaps be urg'd alſo in favour of that *Mix'd Language* which runs throughout theſe Diſſertations. The Speech of *Alexander Bendo* by the Earl of *Rocheſter*, the Pedant in *Ben Johnſon*, and other Writers of Comedies, do ſhew, that the Au-

thor

thor of thoſe Reflections, tho' he carries this way of ſpeaking farther than any ever before him did, is not Singular in the Uſe of it: but this Plea alſo will admit of a Ready Anſwer; that tho' this manner of ſpeaking may be proper for Mountebanks and Pedants, whoſe buſineſs it is to appear Learned to the Ignorant, yet that does not juſtifie the uſe of it by one, who was reckon'd a Scholar, in a Diſcourſe addreſs'd only to Scholars. " 'Tis very " ſtrange that a Critic, and ſuch a Critic as " Dr *Bentley*, ſhould ſo doat on the Dialect " peculiar to Pedantry, who was ſo eminent- " ly μισο — the hater of Pedants (*a*)? and ſo well known to be ſo, that even our Sophiſt in theſe very Diſſertations repreſents him as One whoſe Aim, Profeſſion, and Imployment it was *to pull off the Diſguiſe from thoſe little Pedants, that have ſtalkt ſo long about, in the Apparel of Heroes* (*). (*a*) Diſſer. P. 41. (*) Ibid. P. 29.

" But I love to deal Ingenuouſly; and will " not conceal One Argument, which tho' it " will not do the work, let it go however as " far as it can (*b*), in favour of their Opinion who may aſcribe thoſe Diſſertations to Dr *Bentley*. There is ſtill extant a *Letter* of Dr *Bentley*'s to the Reverend and Learned Dr *Mill* which is confeſs'd to be Genuine, in which there are frequent Scraps of Greek intermix'd with Latin; which might give occaſion to our Sophiſt to think that a *Cento* of Different Languages was a Characteriſtic of this Author: but the caſe of this Epiſtle is widely different from that of theſe Diſſertations. For the Author of the *Epiſtle* writing to One who had a particular Value for the Greek Tongue, (*b*) P. 25.

ſhew'd

ſhew'd an Excellent Judgment in paſſing ſuch a Compliment on that Language, as to uſe it inſtead of Latin, even where Latin would have done as well. But beſides, he had occaſion to expreſs himſelf in Terms of Archneſs and Waggery, which the Latin Tongue would not come up to. For *Johannule* was not in uſe; and therefore Ἰωαννίδιον, or *Little Jacky*, was the only word that could ſerve to expreſs that in ſhort, which the Latins cannot ſay but by a Periphraſis: Whereas thoſe *Diſſertations* were deſign'd for the benefit of Engliſh Readers, who had as great an Eſteem for their own Tongue, as either for Greek or Latin; and the Uncouth Words here interſpers'd do not add any Beauty to the Style, nor do they convey the Author's thoughts to our Underſtanding with more Diſpatch, or Clearneſs than plain Engliſh would do.

(*a*) P. 36. I doubt not but our Sophiſt had that Letter of Dr *Bentley* to Dr *Mill before his Pen* (*a*), when he counterfeited theſe Diſſertations in the Name of that Reverend Doctor. For 'tis very obſervable that the Preface of this Letter to Mr *Wotton* is borrow'd from the Preface of that to Dr *Mill*; which begins with the Author's remembring a Diſcourſe between Him and Dr *Mill* about *Malela* (*b*), and a Promiſe that Dr *Bentley* had upon that occaſion made to his Friend, of which he was to acquit himſelf in that Letter: this our Sophiſt tranſcribes, changing only the Names, and aſcribes it to the ſame Dr *Bentley*. Had that Dr really wrote theſe Diſſertations,

(*b*) *Or* Malelas, *or* Malala, *or* Malalas: *for that weighty Controverſie about the right Spelling this Word is not yet fully decided.*

tations, his Invention was not ſo narrow and ſtinted, that he ſhould be forc'd to borrow from Himſelf; eſpecially having ſo large an Acquaintance, as he appears to have had, with Works of the ſame Stamp and Character with the Epiſtle he was writing; as *Prefaces*, *Prolegomena*, *Apparatus's*, *Introductions*, &c: but it was Natural Enough for a Sophiſt in his *Mock-Bentley* to *filch* an *Exordium* from the Undiſputed Writings of the true Dr *Bentley*.

The ſame Letter to Dr *Mill* which has furniſh'd us already with one Detection of the Impoſture, will, if ſtrictly examin'd, make a Second Confeſſion from theſe Words. *I had this, Sweeteſt Sir, to ſay of* Alcmæon, *and* Alcmæonides, *which I preſume no man ever ſaid before me; for I do not like their ways, who, being pitiful Jackdaws, by begging here and there a Feather, pretend to ſet themſelves off for right Genuine Peacocks.* "Now here "again am I concern'd for our Sophiſt, that he "is taken tripping. For he values himſelf "highly, and *expects great Thanks for a Diſco-* "*very* * about *Ocellus Lucanus*, which had been long before made and publiſh'd by *Vizzanius*, in his Edition of that Author; and whence 'tis evident it was tranſcrib'd by our Sophiſt into his Diſſertation. Now would Dr *Bentley*, who profeſſes himſelf ſuch an Enemy to borrowing, have thus plum'd himſelf in borrow'd Feathers? "It is a very "Notable Diſcovery, and we are much

Hæc habui, *Milli* Jucundiſſime, quæ de *Alcmæone* & *Alcmæonide*, ore ut opinor alio indicta dicerem: non enim placet eorum ratio, qui cùm meræ Corniculæ ſint, emendicatis hinc inde Plumis germanos Pavones ſe pollicentur. *P.* 20.

* P. 47.

" oblig'd to the Author of it: but then there
" was either a ſtrange Jumping of Good
" Wits, or the Diſſertator is a Sorry Plagia-
" ry. What ſhall we ſay to this matter?
" Dr *Bentley* had the Character of a man of
" Probity and Parts, who had neither In-
" clination nor Need to filch the Sayings of
(a) P. 33. " Others (*a*). Thoſe muſt be unacquainted with his Character, who think he would ſay in his Own Name what he found ſaid to his Hands. In the Letter to Dr *Mill* he omits ſeveral things very proper to his purpoſe, *leſt perchance* (ſays he) *thoſe who are not ſo well acquainted with me ſhould think I had plunder'd the Eſcritoire of* Paulus Leopardus. Would he be there ſo afraid of being thought to tranſcribe *Leopardus?* and would he here value himſelf upon Diſcovering firſt what he plainly copies from *Vizzanius?* Muſt thoſe who think he could borrow be ſuch as did *not know* him? and can we, when we know him upon his Own Declaration to be ſo averſe from borrowing, imagine he would borrow That from another, for which he ſolemnly beſpeaks Thanks from the Learned World? " This
" bears hard upon the Author of the Diſſer-
" tations: but how can we help it? he ſhould
" have minded his Hitts better, when he was
" minded to act the Doctor.

Ne fortè qui Me minùs norunt, *Pauli* me *Leopardi* Scrinia compilare exiſtiment. *Ep.* p. 4.

But that Letter to Dr *Mill* will afford us ſtill greater Conviction that this Diſſertation could not be the Genuine Work of Dr *Bentley*. For that Letter, in the Page above mention'd repreſents Dr *Bentley* proving, that he

he could not eaſily be deceiv'd in knowing whether a Greek Verſe were aſcrib'd to its proper Author: *For in ſuch things as theſe*, ſays he, *I do not eaſily ſuffer my ſelf to be impos'd upon; who, as you know, had once a deſign to publiſh the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, with Emendations, and Notes, a grand work: but now, as they ſay, Another ſort of Life, another ſort of Diet.* Now is it probable, that One who had collected the Fragments of all the Greek Poets, amended them, and wrote Notes upon them, could miſtake *Empedocles* for an *Epic Poet?* But I ſhall not inſiſt upon this; ſince the Paſſage produc'd carries in it a more Direct and Expreſs Proof that Dr *Bentley* could not write theſe Diſſertations. He had deſign'd once it ſeems, to publiſh his Grand Work, the Fragments of the Greek Poets: but he was now, he tells us, engag'd in another way of Life, and muſt therefore apply himſelf to another ſort of Studies: for that I take to be the Import of the Greek Proverb. Now the Diſſertations in diſpute bear date after this Declaration; they pretend to be written by *Richard Bentley* Dr of Divinity, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majeſty; they would be thought to come into the world ſome time after his Lectures were printed in defence of Religion. He was now therefore engag'd in another Profeſſion; and would not, we may be ſure, meddle with a Subject ſo foreign to the buſineſs of a Divine, nor handle it in a manner ſo ill becoming that Character. He who ſcrupl'd

Nam in his Rebus verba mihi dari haud facilè patior; qui, ut ſcis, Fragmenta omnium Poetarum Græcorum cum Emendationibus, ac Notis, Grande Opus, edere conſtitueram: nunc, ut ajunt, ἄλλος βίος, ἄλλη δίαιτα. Ep. *p.* 20.

publiſhing thoſe Fragments, which might have been of good Uſe to the Learned, and might ſome of them have fallen in with Divinity, would much leſs have taken up with ſuch Thin *Diet*, and miſpent ſo much of his precious Time upon ſo fruitleſs Enquiries as thoſe are which are purſu'd in theſe ſeveral Diſſertations. " There is another thing, beſides a " pretty Invention, uſeful for a Lyar, and " that is Good Memory. We will ſuppoſe " our Author to have once known ſomething " of this Declaration of Dr *Bentley*; but he " had, it ſeems, unhappily forgot it, when * Diſſert. " he aſcrib'd theſe Pieces to him *. *p.* 17.

The Sophiſt is not more happy in perſonating Dr *Bentley*, when thro' the whole Courſe of theſe Diſſertations he repreſents him as a Fierce and Angry Writer; and One, who when he thinks he has an advantage over another Man, gives him no Quarter. For the Writer of the Epiſtle to Dr *Mill*, when he had juſt occaſion to be very Severe on ſome, who had taken wrong meaſures in deducing the Etymology of a Greek Word, thus repreſes his Indignation: *But I will not ſay any thing ſeverely of 'em; it is not in my nature to trample upon the Proſtrate.* This ſhews him to have been a Man of Temper, and Good Nature: but our Sophiſt repreſents him as one that has no Mercy upon his Adverſary, when he thinks he has him in his power. The ſuppos'd Editors of *Phalaris* for an imagin'd miſtake in a point of Criticiſm are expos'd as *Nonſenſical Blunderers*, Perſons who had *neither Skill nor Induſtry*, neither

Sed nolo aliquid inclementer dicere; non noſtrum eſt κεμάσαις ἐπιμαίνειν. Ep. *p.* 4.

Know-

Knowledge nor Ingenuity; to be like *Leucon*'s *Aſſes*, a *degree below* Sorry *Criticks*, to write *directly againſt Grammar and Common Senſe*; and are ſet out to the world under this Low and Rude Similitude: *Here are Your Workmen, to mend an Author, as bungling Tinkers do Old Kettles!* What a difference is there between the Two Letter-writers? Mr *Bentley* is calm and forgiving, but Dr *Bentley* is furious and unrelenting: Dr *Mill*'s Friend ſcorns to inſult over the Proſtrate; but Mr *Wotton*'s Friend purſues his Blow: "and don't You yet begin "to ſuſpect the Credit of the Diſſertations *? * *Differ. p.* 62.

Dr *Bentley* was celebrated amongſt the Learned Men of his own and other Countries for one, who was much vers'd in the Learned Languages: and, as it appears by his Letter to Dr *Mill*, he was very converſant in *Suidas*, *Heſychius*, and other Greek *Vocabularies*, *Onomaſticons*, *Etymologicons*, *Lexicons*, *Gloſſaries*, *Nomenclators*, and *Scholia*; ſo that he muſt at leaſt have been acquainted with the Significations of Greek Words: but it appears from what this Sophiſt offers about the Senſe of ſome Greek words †, which he finds in *Phalaris*, that he was not only a perfect Stranger to the beſt Claſſic Authors, but that he wanted that Light which any Ordinary Dictionary would have afforded him. The Librarian was ſo well read in One of theſe Inſtructive Writers, *Heſychius*, as to aſſure Dr *Mill*, between Verſe and Proſe, that, whenever a New Edition of that book came forth, *he could, if he would, correct five thouſand faults in it, more or leſs, that had till that time* † *From the* 62d *to the* 68th *page of this Book.*

defeated the Sagacious Conjectures, and Laborious Diligence of other Criticks (†). Now could any thing that actually *is* in *Heſychius*, eſcape his knowledge, who had ſuch a Deep Inſight into what *is not*, but *ought* to be there? could He who had diſcover'd what had eſcap'd the Utmoſt Diligence of Others, miſs what was obvious to every one that look'd into *Heſychius*? Would Dr *Bentley* have given us ſuch a Caſt of his Skill in conſtruing Greek Words, as to tell us, that διώκειν *anciently ſignified to purſue, when that which fled fear'd and ſhunn'd the purſuer*; and that it *never* ſignified to *follow*, in any other Senſe; when *Heſychius* gives us no other words for διώκει, but ζήλα, ἐπιθυμεῖ, which are far from a Perſecuting Senſe?

Dr *Bentley* is known to have liv'd in the ſame Age, and at the ſame Time, that the Edition of *Phalaris*, with which this Sophiſt is ſo angry, came out: it appears, from the Editor's Preface, that the Dr, being then Library-keeper at *St James's*, deny'd a Common Favour to the Editor, which is complain'd of in that Preface: This doubtleſs gave occaſion to our Sophiſt to forge theſe Diſſertations in the Dr's name, to ſhow his pretended reſentments of that Complaint. Now the Dr himſelf could not be ignorant, that this Edition was put forth by Mr *Boyle*, whoſe Name it ſtill bears. But Our Sophiſt, who liv'd at a greater diſtance from thoſe Times, ſuppoſes it the Joynt-Work of ſeveral: he talks of *our Late*

(†) Id Tibi de plano poſſum promittere, *Milli*, Quinque plus minus millia mendorum Me correcturum eſſe, ſi libuerit, quæ aliorum εὐστοχίαν & laborioſam diligentiam hactenùs illuſerunt. *Ep.* p. 39.

Late Editors, of *thoſe Great Genius's*, *with whom Learning*, *that is leaving the World*, *has taken up her Laſt Reſidence*; of *theſe Annotators*, of our *Ingenious Tranſlators* (*a*): whereas theſe *Editors*, *Genius's*, *Annotators*, *Tranſlators*, could not not be known to one that then liv'd, and were known to Dr *Bentley* (as appears by a MS Letter of his to Mr *Boyle*, now in being) to be one and the ſame Perſon. It is true, that in the Preface to the Edition there are theſe Expreſſions, *Quantum ſcimus*, and *Noſtro Labore*; and in the Dedication, *Tuâ ope adjutus*: which might lead our Sophiſt into a miſtake, that this Edition was the Work of More than One; and that the Perſon, to whom it is dedicated, had aſſiſted in it: as if it were unuſual for the Plural Number to be put for the Singular; or as if a Perſon in that Station could no otherwiſe aſſiſt a Young Gentleman of his College in the Edition of a Book, than by collating Manuſcripts, tranſlating the Text, and writing Comments.

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 66, 71.

Dr *Bentley* is known to have enjoy'd the advantage of a Public Lecture inſtituted by the Hononrable Mr *Robert Boyle*, and by reaſon of that Poſt muſt be ſuppos'd to have had a due reſpect for his Name and Family; ſo that it cannot rationally be preſum'd, he would treat a Gentleman, who had the Honour to be nearly related to that Noble Perſon, with ſo much Contempt and Indignity, as is plainly expreſs'd in ſeveral parts of that Diſſertation.

Dr *Bentley* did alſo flouriſh during the Life of Sir *William Temple*, whilſt that Eminent Perſon was in great Reputation for the Signal and Extraordinary Services he had done for

the Protestant Interest, to the English Nation, and to the King who then reign'd; as also for his Learned Writings, which were then in very great Esteem amongst all those who had a true relish for Sound Sense, and Noble Thoughts, express'd with all the Beauty and Force of proper and significant Language. Now tho' the Dr might without any offence differ in his Sentiments from that Worthy Gentleman, yet it is not credible that a Scholar, a Courtier, and a Divine would so far break in upon all the Rules of Modesty, Decency, and Civility, as to insult over a Person of Sir *William*'s Character, and Merit, as an Ignorant and Illiterate Pretender to Learning; who *could neither discover the true Time, nor the true Value of his Authors; and whose Choice of* Phalaris *and* Æsop, *as then extant, for two great inimitable Originals, was a piece of Criticism of a peculiar Complexion, and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.*

"It must needs be a great Wonder to those "who think these Dissertations Genuine, "how or where they have been conceal'd; "and in what Secret Shop, or unknown Corner of the World they have lain hid, so "that no one has ever taken notice of 'em "for so many Ages. Had these Dissertations "been seen and read, somebody sure would "have quoted somewhat out of 'em; espe-"cially since so many have had occasion to "do so (*a*): for all those who have written concerning Sophisms, and Ill Consequences in arguing, might have furnish'd themselves from hence with all Kinds of Loose and Incoherent Thinking. And those that have publish'd their

(*a*) Disser. p. 63.

their Cenſures upon the Incongruities of Language, and Innovations in Speech, might from every Page of this Author have fetch'd proper Inſtances of the Groſſeſt Improprieties. " So that, by their Silence and Prætermiſſion, " they do as good as declare expreſly, that " they never ſaw our Diſſertation (*a*).

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 64.

But that which ought to weigh moſt with thoſe who have any Honour for Dr *Bentley*, toward clearing him from any ſuſpicion of having written theſe Pieces, is this Conſideration; that That Learned Doctor was choſen out by the then Fathers of the Church, as a fit perſon to vindicate the Truth of Religion againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and all other Oppoſers of Divine Revelation: whereas this Sophiſt is found to make uſe of ſuch Arguments (*b*) to diſprove the Epiſtles of *Phalaris*, as are of Equal weight to prove the Writings of *Moſes* and the New Teſtament to be of much Later date, than they can be conſiſtently with the Pretences of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Religion. " So little regard had " this Bold Writer to fit his Diſcourſes to " the Character of that Reverend and Learned Peſon; and I have had too much Re" gard to Him, in giving him the Honour " and Patience of ſo Long an Examina" tion (*c*)

(*b*) *Vide p.* 121*ſt of his Book.*

(*c*) Differ. *p.* 65.

Since

SInce I have given my ſelf the trouble to examine all the tedious *Proofs* Dr *Bentley* has heap'd together againſt the *Epiſtles*, which I was not in the leaſt concern'd to vindicate; I am oblig'd to ſay ſomething to his *Criticiſms* upon the *Edition* that relate entirely to my Self. I ſhall conſider 'em with the ſame Indifference that I did his Arguments: for as I never profeſs'd my ſelf a Patron of *Phalaris*, ſo neither was it ever in my Thoughts to ſet up for Exactneſs in that Dry Sort of Learning. I enter'd upon the Work meerly as an Exerciſe of my Pen; I ſaw that Life and Smartneſs, which I ſtill reliſh in theſe Epiſtles, quite loſt in the Looſe *Periphraſes*, and *plain Country Latin* (as the Dr calls it) of the former Interpreters. This put me upon trying whether I could expreſs the *Style* as well as the Senſe of the Original in another Language; and repreſent it with ſuch advantage, that They, who are no Maſters of Greek, might ſee ſome faint reſemblance of the Author's Spirit and Genius, in a Tranſlation: in which whether I have been ſucceſsful, and to what degree, muſt be left to the different Humors, and Opinions of Readers. I abhorr Vanity, and the more ſince I have read Dr *Bentley*'s Book, where I ſee it makes ſo unbecoming a Figure: yet This I will be bold to ſay, that even in thoſe Tranſlations of the Greek Authors, which are eſteem'd the Beſt, would a man of ſome know-

knowledge in Criticism exercise all the spite and skill he has that way to find out Mistakes, he might be able to muster up such a Plentiful Number of 'em, as would keep my Poor Version and Notes in Countenance. I question not but there are Errors and Oversights enow in my Translation: I was very Young when I did it; and, to confess the Truth, after I had got a little way into it, and made my first Essays, went thro' the Rest of it without any Great Gust: and 'tis no wonder therefore if I should not be awake sometimes in a Work that I was not very fond of. However, as Many, and as Easie to be found as my Faults are, Dr *Bentley* has yet had the Ill Luck to miss 'em; and to except against such Passages as can I think, to any Unprejudic'd Man, be fairly accounted for. The Town, I own, is Weak and Defenseless enough in conscience; but he has had the Judgment to attack it on that side, where perhaps it lies least expos'd. Upon *Scouring the first Epistle* (as he Cleanlily expresses himself) he finds these Words there, ψυχῆς δὲ νόσον ἰατρὸς ἰᾶται θάνατος, ὃν ἀνεπαχθέστατον &c. προσδέχου. Which in my Latin, runns, [*Animi autem Morbum Medica Sanat Mors, quam quidem nulli gravem*, &c. *expecta*]. He is pleas'd to render it thus, [*For a Disease of the Soul the only Physician is Death: do You therefore expect a most painful one*] and says, My Translation of ἀνεπαχθέστατον [by *nulli gravem*] *produces a flat and far-fetch'd Sense* †. I must own I do not yet see why it is more *flat* to say a Villain shall dye an *Unnatural Death*, than that he shall dye a *Painful* one: and as I little apprehend why he calls this a *far-fetch'd* Sense;

† Dissert. p. 96.

Senſe; I ſuppoſe he cannot mean by a *far-fetch'd* Senſe, a Senſe that the Word ἀνεπαχθὴς is not commonly us'd in; becauſe I never could meet with it us'd in any other Senſe, till Now he has thought fit to tranſlate it *moſt painful*. All the Criticks before him render it by *non gravis*, *non invidioſus*, or by ſome word Equivalent to theſe: and *Hermogenes* thought this a proper ſenſe of the word, when he intitul'd a Chapter περὶ τῦ ἀνεπαχθῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν; which I would adviſe the Dr to read, not only to get a better acquaintance with the Word in queſtion, but to learn too the modeſty and diſcretion not to commend himſelf ſo often, with ſo very ill a Grace. I am ſure he wants to be taught this; and ſince he has juſt now taught me what I knew nothing of before, I could do no leſs than make him this Grateful Return.

He goes on to inſtruct me. *The Greek*, ſays he, *is in the Superlative degree*; *let 'em put it then*, nulli graviſſimam, *and 'twill ſhew 'em the Error of their Verſion* †; that is, let Me tranſlate it for 'em, and I'll undertake to make neither Grammar, nor Senſe of it. But if he will give me leave to tranſlate it my ſelf, ſince it muſt be in the Superlative degree, inſtead of *nulli gravem*, I would put *minimè invidioſam*; and then I do not yet ſee any Error in the Verſion: and I am the more inclin'd to think there's none, becauſe the Dr ſlides off, and takes Refuge in his Strong and Secret Hold, the MSS. *The MS*, he ſays, *reads it* ὃν ἂν ἐπαχθέσταλον; *and They* (as he calls *Me*) *might have embrac'd this Reading, when they ſaw it there.* What MS is this? None of the *Bodly-MSS* read it ſo; nor

† Differ. *p.* 69.

nor the *Arundel*, a Collation of which the Learned *Dean of York* ſent me, after my Edition was finiſh'd. Sure the Dr cannot mean the *King's MS*; he knows I never ſaw That my ſelf; and I hope I am not anſwerable for my Collator's Eyes. And, ſince No-body can ſee it but Dr *Bentley*, I have no great Reaſon to depend upon his Ingenuity. However, if this be the Reading of the King's MS, 'tis frivolous and fit to be neglected: for to Me the Common Reading ſeems to have rather a *Quicker Senſe*, and (having ſhewn Dr *Bentley* to be no great Maſter in Propriety of Speech) I may venture to ſay, as much *Propriety*. Perhaps the Dr might have thought ſo too, but that he has a Peculiar Fondneſs for the *Parapleromatick Particle* ἂν, which he takes to be *a rare and quaint uſage* (*a*): and having met with it Here therefore, is reſolv'd not to part with it. To diminiſh his fondneſs for it, I promiſe to furniſh him upon demand with 30 or 40 Inſtances from *Homer*, and the *Greek Teſtament* (to go no further), where the *Particle* ἂν is us'd as *Parapleromatically* every whit as it would be here, ſhould his Reading prevail.

(*a*) Diſſer. p. 70.

But to wave entring into a Controverſie with him about Particles; let us ſee whether he be not as Exquiſite a Judge in *Latin* as he is in *Greek*: He charges me with *Barbariſm*, *Nonſenſe*, and *New Diſcoveries* in Language, for tranſlating δίκημάτων ἐκόντων, *Scelera non invita*; for he is very poſitive that *Invitus always* means the Agent, is *always* ſpoken of the Perſon, *never* of the Thing, *&c.* But I hope *Propertius*, who liv'd in the Pureſt Age of Latin,

tin, may be preſum'd to underſtand his own Tongue as well as Dr *Bentley*: He (*El.* 16, *L.* 1.) expoſtulating with an Unkind Miſtreſs, ſays, that tho' ſhe was Cruel and Unrelenting, yet if ſhe did but hear his Complaint,

Non—ipſa ſuos poterit compeſcere Ocellos
Surget & invitis ſpiritus in Lachrymis.

Is *Invitis* here joyn'd with the *Perſon* or the *Thing*? if *Propertius* had ſaid, as he does in other places, that Tears would flow *ab Invitis Oculis*; tho' an Eye be improperly call'd a *Perſon*, yet in that caſe I might allow it to be taken *Perſonally*: or had he attributed any *Action* to Tears; as, if he had ſaid, *invita ſurgent Lacrymæ*, *Lacrymæ* might be conſider'd as an *Agent*: but as it ſtands here, *Invitæ Lacrymæ* muſt be render'd *Involuntary Tears*; and to explain it otherwiſe is, I think, contrary to Good Senſe and Good Language too. Were Dr *Bentley* as well acquainted with the Latin of the Great Men in *Auguſtus*'s Age, as with that of the Pedants in This, he would have another Taſt, and another Style. To know the Grammar of a Tongue, and to have a juſt ſenſe of the Proprieties and Elegancies of it, are two different things; as different almoſt as Conſtruing *Euclid*'s Words, and being Maſter of his Demonſtrations. Any-body that will take the pains may be Critically exact in the Signification and Syntax of Words; but to enter into the Spirit and Beauty of good writing is an Happineſs that None have but thoſe who are Born with it; nor All of them neither: for a Long Converſation

ſation with Bad Books may deſtroy a good Natural Taſt. I don't ſay, this is Dr *Bentley*'s caſe; for I am not a Judge whether he ever had any.

To come a little nearer to *His* Ages of Latin, I will give him a Couple of Inſtances of the ſame kind out of *Statius*: One of them from the 9th *Thebais*; where Young *Dryas*, after he was mortally wounded, ſends this Meſſage to his Mother,

——*Merui, Genetrix, pœnas; invita capeſſens*
Arma Puer rapui, nec Te retinente quievi. V. 891.

Invita is here apply'd not to the *Perſon* his Mother, but to the *Thing* Arms taken up againſt her Will. In the 7th *Thebais* the *Græcians* are encourag'd by *Jupiter* to make a furious aſſault upon *Thebes*; and *Bacchus* in his Speech to *Jupiter* on this occaſion, ſays,

Eſto olim invitum *jaculatus nubibus ignem*;
Credimus: en iterum atra refers incendia terris,
Nec Styge juratus, nec Pellicis Arte rogatus?
V. 158.

Jupiter, by his Vow to *Semele*, was oblig'd, againſt his own Inclination, to grant what ſhe ask'd: and therefore the deſtruction he brought upon her was *Involuntary*: I think *Invitum* can bear no other ſenſe here, and I therefore leave theſe Paſſages with Dr *Bentley* to conſider at his Leiſure; Let him try his Skill upon 'em, next time the angry Fit of Criticiſm returns.

I ſee there is no way of pleaſing an Incens'd

cens'd Diſſertator; I have juſt clear'd my ſelf from the Imputation of uſing a Word in *a different* ſenſe from other Writers; and now he accuſes me for uſing a Word in the *ſame* ſenſe with all the Authors that ever writ. I tranſlate θερτρίπεις *Hortaris*, which I interpret by *Provocas*, as *Budæus* does; who in his Learned Commentary has theſe words, θερτρίπτ, *provocant, cient*; *& uſus eſt ſatis frequens*: and I tranſlate it ſo, becauſe I could find no other Signification of it in any Greek Writer; and Dr *Bentley* himſelf owns as much, that it is no otherwiſe us'd by *any of the Ancients*. Now I never deſigning to make a Noiſe with the Corrections and Improvement of Old Vocabularies, was contented to uſe words in the ſame Senſe that every-body had us'd 'em before me; and for this Error of mine, my Indictment runs, that I am *an Illiterate Fatherer of an abſurd, ridiculous, and incongruous Senſe upon my Author*. My Plea is, that it ſeems to Me no more abſurd, or ridiculous, that *Phalaris* ſhould ſay to one of his Enemies, *You provoke me to be cruel*, than that he ſhould ſay (as Dr *Bentley* would have him) *You upbraid me with Cruelty*. And I believe his Cavil againſt the *Syntax* of ἃ ἐμοὶ θερτρίπεις is no better grounded than that againſt the *Senſe*. He won't indeed find θερτρίπω in his Grammar with a Dative Caſe, but *he may pleaſe to inlarge it from this very place* *: and as for his εἰς ἃ, or ἐφ' ἃ, we have no occaſion for either of 'em: in the days of *Sophocles* ταῦτά σ' θερτρέπω was no more abſurd and incongruous, than *Quæ me hortaris* was in *Tully*'s. But Dr *Bentley* thinks he *has ſhewn already, that* θερτρέπω *ſignifies*

* Diſſert. p. 75.

niſes to reproach * ; where has he ſhewn it? he has no where ſaid any thing of it, but in the 52d page; and there he only ſays, that προτείνειν, *to accuſe, is an Innovation in Language, for which the Ancients us'd* προφέρειν : ſo that poſitively to averr, and aſſume the thing in queſtion is in his Language to *ſhew*, and prove it. Let us ſee now whether his Second Thoughts furniſh him with any better proof of προτείνειν ſignifying to *accuſe*. One would expect that he ſhould produce the Authority of ſome Greek Author, that uſes προτείνειν in this ſenſe: but he has given this argument quite another turn, and proves, that 'tis us'd ſo here, *becauſe 'tis never us'd ſo by any ancient Author before the Sophiſt* †; he might have added too, nor by any Modern Author ſince. This is a ſurprizing way of arguing, but I find it familiar to Dr *Bentley*; he has another juſt of this ſtrain in the 115th page: he ſays there, *One may know* Sabirius Pollo *to be a Roman*; how ſo? does he find any ſuch Family among the *Romans?* no, that's too Obvious a Way of arguing for a man of his Parts: he knows him to be a *Roman*, becauſe he *does not find ſuch a Family as the* Sabirii, *or ſuch a Sirname as* Pollo: and he improves this Acquaintance with *Sabirius* ſo far, that within Three pages he calls him *his Friend Sabirius Pollo.* Such are the New Ways of Reaſoning made uſe of by this Incomprehenſible Author: He has furniſh'd us with ſeveral; and, to ſhew that he is not yet exhauſted, he brings This argument to prove that προτείνειν ſignifies to *reproach*: προφέρειν, and *vitio vertere* ſignifie *to reproach*; therefore προτείνειν does ſo too: and

* *Diſſert.* p. 71.

† *Ibid.* p. 72.

in the ſame Paragraph, he after the ſame manner makes it out, that διατείνω is *to perſevere*; is not διατείνω *exactly the ſame with* pertendo? (meaning, I ſuppoſe, that διὰ is *per*, and τείνω *tendo*) *and is not* pertendo *to perſevere?* I always thought that *Uſe* was the only Rule and Meaſure of the Signification of words; but Dr *Bentley*, a great Adventurer in new ways of thinking, will determine it by dint of Argument. Would he allow Others to argue as He does, from One Compound Word to Another, and from One Language to Another, we might *enlarge our Dictionaries* without End; and ſoon produce not only (what he pretends to *) *five thouſand*, but five Millions of Emendations and Additions to *Heſychius*; tho' not ſuch as are fit only to keep Company with the Admirable Biſhop *Pearſon*'s Obſervations on that Author: and therefore ſhould they hereafter come together (as 'tis ſaid they will); and ſhould the *Biſhop*'s Name not happen to be ſet to His part (as 'tis poſſible it may not); it will be no difficult matter to diſtinguiſh between 'em. According to the Dr's Rule (not to go far from the words he plays with) becauſe διαφέρειν ſignifies *to differ*, therefore *by a Like Metaphor, and Analogy, we may uſe* διατρέπειν *to expreſs the ſame notion* †: And thus agen I can prove, that *præverto* is to *exhort*; for is not *præverto* exactly the ſame as προτρέπω? and is not προτρέπω to exhort? or that δίζημαι is to *perſevere*; for is not δίζημαι exactly the ſame with *perſiſto?* and is not *perſiſto*, to *perſevere?* So that for ought I can ſee, it muſt be allow'd, either that all words may be us'd e'en as we pleaſe, or

* *Epiſtola in fine Malalæ*, p. 39.

† Diſſert. p. 73.

or elſe that προτρέπω muſt ſignifie, as it has done for above Two thouſand years, *hortari*; that is, not always to *Exhort*, (a Word he makes ſuch wretched Mirth with) but to *excite* by any other methods: unleſs when *Virgil* ſays, *Jam Vitulos hortare*; and *Ovid*, *Hortatúrq; Canes*; they mean, that *Dogs* and *Bullocks* are to be made tractable by good Advice and Exhortation.

If our Critic is unalterably determin'd, that the Senſe of this Paſſage muſt be [*the Crimes which You* upbraid *me with*] why ſhould he not chuſe rather to read προτρέπεις than ἀστρέπεις? for tho' I no more know an Inſtance of ἀστρέπω than of προτρέπω's being us'd for ἐνοχλίζω, yet the Formation of the Word will more eaſily and naturally allow of this uſe: Τὰ ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις may well enough ſignifie, *quæ mihi vitio vertis*; but ἀστρέπεις, in that ſenſe, is, I think, a very *improper* and unnatural *Innovation in Language*.

One would wonder that Dr *Bentley* ſhould be ſo eager in imputing this Miſtake to my Tranſlation, which he is ſo little capable of making out; but he had a double End in it: My Explication of the Word offended him ſo much the more, becauſe it ſpoilt an Argument that He urges, to prove the Epiſtles Spurious: I ſhall draw it up in ſhort, but in its full force and ſtrength; and leave it to the Conſideration of the Reader. Ἀστρέπω *was never us'd for* ἐνοχλίζω *in any ancient Author before the Epiſtles, nor by any modern Author ſince the Epiſtles; nor in the Epiſtles themſelves:* therefore *the Epiſtles are Spurious*. This Weighty Point is ſhut up with a Piece of Hiſtory,

ſtory, that is worſe founded than his Criticiſm; and proceeds from Something which was always thought a greater Blemiſh to a Divine, than want of Judgment. He ſays, *The Edition aſcrib'd to* Cujacius, *and another of* Aldus; *tho' the Two Principal of All, and Both of 'em in the Public Library at* Oxon; *had yet the Odd Fortune to lye all the while conceal'd from our Late Editors that liv'd there* (*a*). I am at a Loſs how to deal with a man of this Extraordinary Confidence, that can ſo boldly aſſert what 'tis impoſſible he ſhould know. What ſhall I ſay to One, who will face me down, that I never ſaw, what I know my ſelf to have often ſeen and us'd? nay, and will prove this to me out of my own Preface? the place he quotes is this, *Codices Impreſſos quatuor præ manibus habui qui eodem planè Textu utuntur; apud quos Verſiones ſunt duæ, altera à* Naogeorgo, *altera in* Uſum Schol. Soc. Jeſ. *edita* (*b*). Two of the Four Books I here particularly mention'd, how does he know but thoſe he mentions are the Other Two I mean? as indeed they are. I had no occaſion to name 'em, becauſe I found little Difference in 'em from thoſe which I had in my Own Study: the Verſion aſcrib'd to *Cujacius*, is exactly the ſame with That, put out for the *Schools of the Jeſuites*, which I have expreſly ſaid I made uſe of. A man of any Candour and Fairneſs, or indeed of any Common Modeſty, would not have preſum'd, upon ſo ſlight Grounds, ſo poſitively to aſſert, that I had overlook'd what lay ſo plainly in my way: but I am the leſs ſurpriz'd to hear this from Dr *Bentley*, who would fain perſwade me that I never ſaw my Own Edition.

(*a*) Differ. *p.* 73.

(*b*) *Vide* Præf. *p.* 3.

In

In the Body of this Dissertation there are Two other Mistakes, which the Dr has found in my Version: I took no notice of 'em where they lay; but, to avoid Confusion, reserv'd 'em for this place. The First is, my rendring ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων, *poculorum Vitreorum*, as *Suidas*, *Etymologicon Magnum*, and *Favorinus* had done before me. These are Eminent Names in that Sort of Learning, which Dr *Bentley* seems best acquainted with, and most to value himself upon; and therefore, one would think, should be able to excuse me with him: but his Maxim is, to value nothing any further than it is to his purpose. When *Suidas* is brought in for preserving some few Fragments of *Babrius* *, then he is a man that converses with *Writers of Size and Quality*: but when he is produc'd for that, *which will leave us not the least Footstep of our Corinthian Potter* (*a*), and *whereby the argument about* Thericles *would vanish into nothing* (*b*); then he is a trifling Scribler, his Lexicon consists of *Excerpta from Scholiasts and Glossaries* (*c*). If once he begins to quarrel thus with his Good Friends the Lexicographers, I can expect no mercy from him: But I would ask him, why he says that in the *particular passage before us neither the Use of Language nor Good Sense will allow* Θηρίκλεια ποτήρια to be translated *Glasses*? When *Phalaris* is said to send *Cups of Gold and Silver*, and besides † *Ten Couple* Θηρικλείων ποτηρίων, to me it seems agreeable to *Good Sense*, that these Cups, which are here distinguish'd from Cups of Gold and

* Dissert. p. 140.

(*a*) Ibid. p. 27.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Ibid.

† Ἀπέσταλκά σοι φιάλας ἀπέφθου χρυσοῦ τέσσαρας, καὶ κρατῆρας ἀργυροῦς οὐ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς τέχνης δύο, καὶ ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα· Ep. 70.

Silver, should not be as Dr *Bentley conceives*, *Silver at least*, *if not of a more precious Metal*; unless there be some other Metal, besides Gold, more precious than Silver. He may be as Merry upon these Glasses as he pleases, and call 'em *Odd and Stingy Presents*, *Cheap and Brittle Compliments*; I am not answerable for *Phalaris*'s Generosity. Besides, I freely own my self Ignorant how cheap Glasses were in *Sicily* two thousand Years ago; for ought I know, they might be Great Rarities, and fit to bear the Rest of his Presents Company; especially being of so Vast a Size as they appear to have been, and sent in so much greater Number than the Other Presents were: for the Epistle tells us, there were but *Two* Cups of Silver, and *Four* of Gold; and *Ten Couple* of those of *Thericles*. From whence one would be apt to conclude, that they were of a *Baser*, and *not of a more Precious Metal than Silver and Gold*, as the Dr imagines. I can bear all his Raillery upon *Phalaris* here for a *Stingy* Present: but why is he offended with Me too for a *Present* I never design'd him? He says I have presented him with an Emendation of *Poculorum Vitreorum*, whereas the former Interpreters honestly translated it, *Thericlean Cups*. But I must put the Dr in mind to quote those *Honest Translators* honestly: he knows One of the Two translates it *Poculorum Vitreorum*, as I do; I mean *Cujacius* (or whoever else be the Author of that Version ascrib'd to him) whom the Dr is pleas'd to say, I never saw.

With the same Sincerity he tells me, that whereas I have render'd πίτυος δίκην, *in morem arun-*

arundinis (*a*); the Tranſlation in the former Editions was, *inſtar pinûs* (*b*). Here again I have follow'd the Verſion, which he adviſes me to conſult in my next Edition (*c*), the Verſion of *Cujacius*, which has it, *in morem Arundinis:* and this I did, becauſe I thought it would be a greater piece of juſtice to my Author, to make the Paſſage in him Clear and Intelligible, than to tranſlate a Greek Proverb Literally, which would have been no Proverb in Latin. Dr *Bentley* would probably have interpreted it Literally, on purpoſe to have had an occaſion of explaining it; I could have done ſo too, and have cramm'd a Page of *Eraſmus* into my Notes, as He has here into his Diſſertation: but I am glad I tranſlated it as I did; for 'tis pity the Dr ſhould have wanted an Opportunity of ſhewing how exceſſively Witty he could be upon this Proverb. Ἐκτρίψω αὐτὸς πίνῳ δίκλῳ, ſays *Phalaris*, *I will extirpate them like a Pine-Tree*; and this Tree (according to the Dr's Natural Hiſtory) *periſhes by Lopping*. He takes this Hint to tell me, that I have *lopp'd off a Branch of his Evidence* *, that I have *executed this Proverb upon it ſelf, and extirpated the Pine-Tree out of my New Verſion* *; that I have *rooted up the Pine-Tree, and tranſplanted Reeds* * thither: which he *confeſſes is above his Small Underſtanding in Gardening* *. What a Deluge of Wit is here! all theſe fine things are ſaid within the Compaſs of half a Page: who can reſiſt a Writer, that thus takes care, that his Fancy ſhall ſtill keep pace with his Judgment; and that the One ſhall not Inſtruct You more than the Other Entertains

(*a*) Ep. 92.
(*b*) Differ. p. 29.
(*c*) Ibid. p. 75.

* P. 29, 30.

You? However, after he has refresh'd himself a little, he must give me leave to tell him, that his *Understanding in Gardening* is indeed very *Small* (as small as his Knowledge in Natural History) if he thinks that it has any thing to do either with *Reeds* or *Pines*; which, I take it, grow as rarely in Gardens, as *Mushrooms* arise out of *Rotten Passages in Authors*. Dr *Bentley* must indeed be allow'd to understand Some parts of Gardening very well; particularly *Transplanting* and *Weeding*: The First of these he has prov'd his Skill in by those Few Notions that are worth any thing in his Piece; for they are *transplanted* from Other Mens Prefaces, the Nurseries of all his Critical Learning: His Skill in the Second is made out by all the Rest of his Appendix; which is nothing else but a Collection of Ill *Weeds*, pull'd up out of Good Writers. There is, I remember, a Passage in *Athenæus*, where this Happy Talent of *Weeding Authors* is very well express'd: I shall give it the Learned Reader, together with three or four Lines that introduce it; because it is, all together, one of the Shortest and Liveliest Accounts I have met with of a Man possess'd with the Spirit of Criticism. Οὐδὲν ἄλλο σὺ οἶσθα, says *Cynulcus* to *Ulpian*, οὐ λόγους διεξοδικοὺς εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἱστορίας μνησθῆναι, οὐ τῆς ἐν λόγοις χάριτος ἀπάρξασθαί ποτε: ἀλλὰ χρόνον ἅπαντα σὺ ταῦτα κατετρίβης ζητῶν, κεῖται, οὐ κεῖται (+); εἴρηται, οὐκ εἴρηται; very entrance, tells us, this *Ulpian* was such an insufferable Pedant, that he would neither Eat nor Drink any thing, till he had ask'd the Questions κεῖται, οὐ κεῖται? and satisfied himself in what Greek Author the Word, by which it was call'd, was to be found; from whence, he says, he got the Name of Κειτούκειτος: which, I desire Dr *Bentley*, may be added to *Chlonthachonthlus*, as a Like Instance of the Name of a man but *once* mention'd in old Authors.

(+) The Epitomizer of *Athenæus*, at the

ἐξονυ-

ἐξονυχίζεις τε πάντα τὰ προσπίπτοντα τοῖς συνδιαλεγομένοις, τὰς ἀκάνθας συνάγων,

Ὡς ἀν' Ἐχινόποδας, καὶ ἀνὰ τρηχεῖαν Ὄνωνιν
ἀεὶ διατρίβων, Ἀνθέων τῶν ἡδίστων οὐδὲν συναθροίζων·

L. 3, *C.* 17. A Character, which will fit the *Ulpians* of Our Time, as well as those of *Athenaeus*'s; for the Race of 'em is not yet extinguish'd.

I have follow'd our Dissertator thro' a long Scene of Impertinence; and am come at last to That Part, where he Places his greatest Strength; that is indeed, the most Trivial Part of all, the MSS. I told the Reader in my Preface, that I only made use of such different Readings in the MSS, as conduc'd to the better understanding the Text; for I always thought it a Ridiculous piece of Pedantry to load a book with Various Lections to no purpose: but this I find Dr *Bentley* calls *Skill in using MSS.* He and I differ in our Notions about these matters; and I hope we always shall.

In the 64th Epistle, the Printed Copies read ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνδεέστερον ἤδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους· I saw the MSS here had a Various Reading ἢ δεῖ for ἤδη, which I pass'd over with that Contempt it deserv'd, and guess'd it should be ἐκτενέστερον; a Reading, that with a very small Alteration made my Author speak Sense: Let us see, what Dr *Bentley*, and his MSS make of it. *Phalaris* says, νῦν οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις ὁρῶμαι· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνδεέστερον ἤδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους: πίστιν γὰρ οὔτε παρ' ἄλλοις τισὶν, οὔτ' ἐν φίλοις βέβαιαν εὗρον· Which I would render thus, *I am not so much as seen by my Nearest Relations; and I now*

now the more carefully avoid mankind, becauſe I have found no Faith nor Truſt, not only among Other Perſons, but even among my Friends themſelves. Dr *Bentley* ſays, we muſt take ἢ δὲ here for a *certain Correction.* But ſince the Tyrant is giving a reaſon for his *preſent* Recluſe way of Living in oppoſition to his former freedom and openneſs, methinks ἤδη can't well be ſpar'd here. Beſides [*I avoid all mankind leſs than I ought to do*] ſeems to Me a very improper expreſſion; eſpecially after a Man has ſaid, that he avoided all mankind to ſuch a Degree as *not to be ſeen by his Neareſt Relations*, would he add immediately, that he avoided Company leſs than he ought to do? What would Dr *Bentley* have him do more? or how can a Man be more retir'd than by ſeeing no-body? I deſire the Dr to have ſome Regard to Senſe, as well as to MSS.

This ἐνδεέστερον returns agen in the 68th Epiſtle, ἐμαυτὸν ἐνδεέστερον ἐυρίσκω ἤδη χρηστότητι πειθὸς ὑπηρετεῖν· *Now here too*, he ſays, *Every one of the MSS have it* ἢ δὲ. As for the King's MS, no body knows what it has, or has not; and this Epiſtle is wanting in one of the *Bodley* MSS: ſo that all theſe MSS that I have overlook'd prove at laſt to be but One; in which perhaps I might not obſerve this Various Reading. But if I had obſerv'd it, I think I ſhould ſcarce have made uſe of it; for if we put ἢ δὲ in the room of ἤδη, ἐνδεέστερον muſt be an Adverb, and referr'd to ὑπηρετεῖν: and the Rules of good Language will hardly allow, that the Adverb ſhould be joyn'd in Place to one

one Verb, and in Sense to another, at such a distance: not to insist on the Ambiguity that arises from its Neighbourhood to ἐμαυτὸν, to which it seems to be naturally joyn'd as an Adjective; and 'tis with some difficulty, that we bring our selves to understand it otherwise, even after the Correction of ἤδη into ἢ δεῖ is allow'd to prevail. Had the Author intended ἐνδεέστερον for an Adverb, he would probably have put it after εὑρίσκω, and not before it. I am so us'd to Dr *Bentley*'s Language, that I can easily bear his telling me here, that *I make meer Nonsense of the Context*: whether I do or no, must be left to those who will take the trouble of considering it. Indeed such a fair and ingenuous Translator as Dr *Bentley*, that renders ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτούμενος, *than I want Money to give*, may make Nonsense of any thing.

There is yet one Instance more of Unskilfulness that he charges upon me, διατείνων ἐν οἷς ἐστιν, I translate, *perpendens suam Conditionem, considering the Circumstances he is in*, as *Naogeorgus* had translated it before me; the Dr renders it, *persistens in proposito, proceeding in his present ways*, according to *Cujacius*: neither of us produce any Instance of our Use of the word διατείνω, nor pretend to do it; we are meerly upon the Guess, what it must signifie, by its relation to the Sentence: and which of us guesses best, is to be determin'd by our Readers. Had I been never so much out, he might have taken a more Courtly way of letting me know it, than by saying that *Leucon carries one thing*, and *his* Ass *another*; that is, the Writer of the Greek Epistle means

means differently from the *Aſs* his Editor: This is ſuch a Compliment as there is but one Proper way of Returning; Gentlemen do not uſe to reſent ſuch Language with their Pens only. But I forgive him; 'tis a Mode of Speech familiar to him, I find, and which he beſtows on every one he has to deal with: In the 11th page, the Sophiſt is *an Aſs under the Skin of a Lyon*; in the 59th, *Phalaris* himſelf is *a meer Aſinus ad Lyram*. Since he is ſo fond of *Aſinine Proverbs*, I will throw him in One out of *Ariſtophanes*, to compleat his Collection. It is, Ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια; upon which *Eraſmus* has this Remarkable Gloſs; *Aſinus portans Myſteria, in eos dicebatur qui præter dignitatem in Munere quopiam verſantur; velut ſiquis ignarus literarum Bibliothecæ præficeretur*: in Engliſh thus, *The Proverb of* an Aſs carrying Myſteries *was apply'd to Thoſe who were preferr'd to ſome Place they did not deſerve, as when a Dunce was made a Library-keeper.* And if that *Library-keeper* ſhould ſo far miſtake his Office, as to think he was put there, not to ſhew Books to Gentlemen that came to ſee 'em, but to keep the Door ſhut, he would be ſtill more unfit for the Place. I have had Worſe Treatment than this from Dr *Bentley*: for he has not only deny'd my Collator the uſe of the King's MS, but dealt with me all-along, as if I had ſeen it, and us'd it my ſelf; once before, in the caſe of ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, and here agen in relation to διατείνων. Having no Authorities to countenance my Verſion of διατείνων by *expendens*, I laid hold of a different Reading in the King's MS, ſent me by my Collator, where he aſſur'd me it was διὰ πάνυ.

Dr

Dr *Bentley* puts on his Critical Spectacles, and finds, that tho' it be διά τινων now, it was originally διατείνων; and that the ε has been *eras'd* by a modern hand, *as appears by a Void Space*: and upon this he triumphs over my Skill in perusing the MS, when he knows it was fifty Miles off of me, all the Time of the Edition. What *Void Spaces* now *appear* in that MS, how many *Erasings* there are, or by what *Hand*, it matters not much to dispute, or enquire. I own I overlook'd the *false accenting* of these words, which he charges me with: but to set down my translation of διὰ τίνων, *ob ea*, and at the same time to say, I make it an *Interrogative*, is according to Dr *Bentley*'s way of representing things: he should either have been less severe with Me (*a*) on the account of My mistakes of this kind, or have taken more care to prevent his Own; Some of which, since he condescends to these Trifles, I shall so far comply with him, as to give the Reader an account of.

(*a*) Nos *Phalarin* Grammaticum habemus, qui perperàm scripta etiam capite punit. *Cic. in Pison.*

P. 8. τίνας ἀν for τίνας ἂν. P. 19. Ετεύξε for ἔτευξε. P. 18. μηδ' ἀν for μηδ' ἂν. P. 21. οἵτε τὰς for οἵτε. P. 35. ὡς φάσι τινες for ὡς φασί τινες. P. 45. Ἰώνας for Ἴωνας. P. 48. ζώα for ζωά. Ibid. ἔπειδ' for ἐπεὶ δ'. P. 61. πάντα for παντᾷ. P. 70. ἂν for ἂν. P. 94. συνέγραψέ δὲ for συνέγραψε δὲ. P. 129. κτλίποιμεν for κτλείποιμεν. P. 138. ἠπιστάμην for ἠπιστάμην. P. 139. ἐλαταῖς for ἐλάταις. Ibid. Οὐδὲ οἱ for οὐδέ οἱ. Ibid. ἄδε for ἅδε. P. 146. ἔτωρον for ἑταῖρον &c.

The

The Reader will think the Controverſy runs low when we begin thus to diſpute about Accents and Encliticks; and indeed I think ſo too: but how can I help it? My Excuſe muſt be, that I was oblig'd to engage the Dr in what way he lik'd beſt, and had not the Choice of my Own Weapons.

And now are not Theſe, which I have gone thro', Mighty Blemiſhes to my Edition? and fit to be inſiſted on by the Dr, in order to Humble Me and *my Teachers*? He takes care to tell me, that he can produce more Inſtances of this kind; I queſtion not but he may: but if he can find out no more Conſiderable Miſtakes than theſe, I think he may leave off Criticiſing upon this Subject.

For my part, I am not much concern'd what the Men of Letters think of my Skill in Languages or Manuſcripts: but it concerns Dr *Bentley* to conſider what the Men of Sincerity will think of his falſe and diſingenuous Dealing; what the Men of Modeſty and Humility will think of his Lofty Inſulting Language; what the Men of Good Nature and Candor will think of his Fierce and Vindictive Temper: how the Men of Taſte and Breeding will reliſh his Scurrilous Language, his Frigid Jeſts, his Low and Clowniſh Expreſſions; how the Men of Reaſon and Judgment will approve his Weak and Inconcluſive Ways of Arguing: it is a mighty Imputation upon Him, to have any of theſe Bad Qualities, or to want any of theſe Good ones: but it is no Great Blot upon Me, if I ſhould appear not to be exactly well skill'd in the Learned Languages.

I was

I was ſatisfied from ſome Books lately written, what a wide difference there is between a Man of Cloſe Arguing, and Rambling Learning; and how unnatural a Step it is for an *Amanuenſis* to ſtart up a Profeſſor of Divinity. This indeed made me not expect much from Dr *Bentley* in the Reaſoning Way: but when he came to Matters of Pure Criticiſm, I thought One, who had bent all his Thoughts and Reading that way, One who has now the ſole Uſe and Power of the King's Library, and had for many Years attended upon one of the Greateſt Scholars in *Europe*; One that ſet out with all theſe Advantages, I thought, might eaſily have confounded a Young Writer, that never aim'd at being a Critic in the Greek Tongue, or made the Niceties of it his peculiar Study and Buſineſs. But, to conſult the ſeveral Editions, to collate the Manuſcripts, to turn over Dictonaries, nay, and to make 'em; and all this ado, only to find a falſe Accent, and an Eſcape in peruſing a Manuſcript (which I have ſhewn to be the utmoſt of the Dr's Atchievement on this Article) ſeems to Me to ſavour too much of the Character of thoſe men, who, as he himſelf makes the Obſervation, without conſidering whom it hits, love to make a Noiſe about Trifles; or (not to wrong him of his Own more Elevated Expreſſions) *to make a Tide and a Flood in a Baſin of Water.*

Nothing has done Learning more diſſervice among the Senſible part of Mankind, than that indiſcreet Value, which Men of Letters oftentimes put upon the moſt trifling parts of Knowledge; that μικροφιλομυθία in the way of

of Scholarſhip, of which *Theophraſtus* has given us a Character, as it relates to Human Life and Affairs. 'Tis this that has brought ſo ill a Report upon Criticks and Criticiſm, and ſunk extreamly the value of that Sort of knowledge, which has been of ſuch Excellent uſe to the World, when wiſely employ'd.

A Good *Critic* is a Name that deſerves Honour; for it carries in it Probity, Learning, Reliſh, Good Nature, and Good Senſe, with a great many Other very deſirable Qualities: but as the Word is now generally employ'd to ſignifie a Captious, Vain, Opinionative, Half-learn'd, Ill-natur'd Cenſurer of other Mens Labours, I muſt confeſs, I think nothing can be more deſpicable. Let us ſtop a while, e'er we take our Leave of this argument, to conſider their ſeveral Characters.

A Good Critic diſtinguiſhes himſelf always by the Choice of his Subject; it is ſome Point of Importance, and worth determining: an Ill One is ever buſied in things of no manner of Uſe nor Conſequence; and yet is as full of Himſelf, and his Performances, as if the Commonwealth could not ſubſiſt without 'em.

A Good Critic is modeſt and Decent in his Cenſures, Candid and Impartial; he treads warily, uſes his Judgment much, but diſtruſts it more: ſpeaks with Reſpect of thoſe he differs from; never takes a pleaſure in inſulting over their Miſtakes, or leſſening their Reputations. *Iſaac Caſaubon*, *Ger. Voſſius*, and *Grotius*, were all men of this Caſt; and ſo was *Menage* too, 'till *Baillet*, toward the Latter End of his Life, provok'd him. The Character

racter which our Excellent *Pearſon* * gives of him, is very remarkable, and fit to be conſider'd by Dr *Bentley* before he appears agen in the way of Criticiſm. *Quanta animi moderatio! quantus Candor! veram Criticam cum nullius famæ diſpendio exercere; nullius Exiſtimationem lædere, nullius Erroribus inſultare, nuſquam ex Muſæo Laureolam quærere; per quos profeceris apertè profiteri; à Viris Doctiſſimis non, niſi ſalvo eorum honore, apertè diſſentire: ut exclamare cogar, O ſecur verè Criticum ſine Splene!* In which alſo he drew his Own, as well as *Menage*'s Character.

* *In his Letter to* Menage *before* Diogenes Laertius.

Salmaſius and *Scaliger* had nothing of this in 'em, they were all Gall, and Pride, and Pedantry; which made the Vaſt Learning they were Maſters of ſit ſo ill upon 'em, that the World hated and deſpis'd 'em, at the ſame time that it was profiting by 'em: Mr *Wotton* tells us, *There are ſome now alive whoſe Fame will one day equal that of the* Scaliger's (or, as it is in his Laſt Edition, the *Salmaſius's) and* Grotius's *of other Nations* †. If he had put *Salmaſius* into *Grotius*'s, and not into *Scaliger*'s Room, I would ſo far have agreed with him, that there are ſome now alive, who will inherit Their Fame, as to One great part of their Character; for they have All their Ill Qualities in Perfection — with but a ſlight Mixture of any of their Good ones. For my part, were Dr *Bentley* as great a Scholar, as Some ſay he is, or even as He thinks himſelf to be: yet I had rather not know the Greek Alphabet, than have his Knowledge and his Manners together: for as much

† *Reflect. upon Anc. and Mod. Learning*, p. 385.

much as I value Learning, I value Good Sense, and Common Civility more.

A Good Critic is rich in his own Store; he has a sure Fund of Good Judgment and True Knowledge, which he can trust to upon all Occasions, without needing to rifle his Neighbours: but an Ill Critic, who sets up the Trade without a Stock to manage it, must be perpetually upon the Plunder: the great Employment of his *Sagacity* is, to find out Hints in Odd Corners of Books, where 'tis probable no-body else will look for 'em; the chief Exercise of his *Judging* Talent lies in distinguishing, what Borrow'd Notions he may most safely put off for his Own, and with the least danger of being Discover'd.

A man of a sound and well-weigh'd Judgment is afraid always of standing by himself in a New Opinion; but a Smatterer in Criticism is bold, and forward; loves to maintain Paradoxes, and to defie the World. 'Tis enough to make him think a thing true or false, that every-body else has thought the contrary: for he has no way of Distinguishing himself, but by being Singular.

A Critic Really such, always proportions his pains to the difficulty of the matter he is engag'd in, and dwells upon things more or less, as they want more or less to be dwelt on: but a Pretender is constantly improper and impertinent in his Learning; where the Knott of a Dispute is, there You find him very reserv'd and silent; but he lets loose all his Criticisms upon You in plain points, that No-body is in danger of misunderstanding.

So

So have I ſeen the loſt Clouds pour
Into the Seas an Uſeleſs Shower;
Whilſt the vex'd Sailors curs'd the Rain,
For which Poor Shepherds pray'd in vain.

To compleat the Character of a Critic, it is requiſite, that he ſhould write well in that Way he pretends to cenſure; and be a Good Pattern, in order to be thought a Good Judge. The Ancient Criticks were generally ſo, as *Ariſtotle*, and *Longinus*, *Tully*, and *Quintilian*: but *Some now alive* have ventur'd to Criticize upon the Performances of very fine Pens, while they themſelves had the worſt in the World; and have ſet up for Judges of Good Writing by a Taſt form'd upon the Opinions and in a Style drawn from the Expreſſions of Modern Prefaces and Comments.

'Twere endleſs to reckon up all the Particulars that diſtinguiſh their Characters; inſtead on't, take a Reflection or two which Monſieur *St Euvremont* *, (a Fine Writer, and a Good Judge) has made on this Subject.

* Oeuvres mêleés, Troiſieme Tome, p. 28.

I have ſeen (ſays he) *of Late Years, Great Criticks in abundance, but few Good Judges. That Learned Tribe is my Averſion, who are perpetually buſie in reſtoring corrupted Paſſages, that when reſtor'd are at laſt worth nothing. They ſet the higheſt Price on ſuch Knowledge, as one would chuſe to be without, and know leaſt of thoſe things which moſt deſerve to be known. Having no fine way of thinking and ſpeaking themſelves, they can never enter into the Delicacy of another Man's Thought or Expreſſion. They would ſucceed very*

well in explaining and commenting upon a Grammarian; for His mind is thrown into much the same Mould with Theirs, and his Studies have lain the same way; but when they come to one of the Sensible and Wellbred Writers of Antiquity, they neither relish, nor understand him: his Sense and way of Thinking must needs be lock'd up to 'em, 'tis so very different from their Own. In History, they know nothing of Men, or Affairs, they turn all to Chronology; and so they be but able to tell You, what Year Such an One was Consul, they care not whether they are acquainted with his Character, or the Great Events that happen'd in his Time. Cicero *with them goes only for a Maker of* Orations, Cæsar *for a Writer of* Commentaries; *the* Consul, *and the* General, *are lost to 'em. The Genius that animates their admirable Writings is not felt; the Remarkable and Instructive Passages there are not observ'd.*

I beg the Dr's Pardon for leading him into such Writers as *Bruyere*, and *St Evremont*, who think well, and speak Justly, and quote little; I know, upon all these Accounts, they are not for his Taste: to oblige him therefore, I will throw in a Little Latin here from the *Preface* of a *Modern Critic*; and I hope it will go down with him the better for the sake of the Place where I find it. *Hic Criticum*, says my Author, *non Pædagogico Fastu tumentem, at Farragine quâdam Jejunæ Eruditionis onustum formare aggressus sum, sed non minùs Judicio quàm Memoriâ suâ utentem; & qui probè calleat, quàm pauca penitùs in Veterum Monumentis intelligamus, ideóq; Modestè de aliis judicet, & ab Omnibus discere sit paratus. Volo eum ante omnia niti intelligere*

gere quid Veteres velint ; & ſibi diligenter cavere, ne Opinetur ſe Scire quod Neſciat *. Which Good Meaſures had Dr *Bentley*, in his Critical Studies and Attempts, vouchſaf'd to obſerve, he had ſav'd himſelf and Me the trouble of this Public Diſpute about *Phalaris*: He had not raſhly enter'd the Liſts upon an Argument which he is by no means a Maſter of; nor begun an Indiſcreet Controverſie, without conſidering where it might End.

* Le Clerc. Præf. ad Art. Crit.

He threatens me and the World with ſome further Remarks of this kind in *Latin*: I am not, I confeſs, very apprehenſive of that; becauſe, if he had intended to write in that Tongue, it had been proper to have done it at firſt: for in that Tongue the Reflection, that has given him all this Uneaſineſs, was written; and in that Tongue therefore one would think it ſhould have been anſwer'd, and this whole Controverſie manag'd. But whatever He may do, I cannot promiſe him that No other Language will be employ'd againſt him; nor that the Enquiries of Some, whom he has affronted, will not be extended a little farther than theſe *Diſſertations*.

I was indeed in hopes, when I firſt put pen to paper, that the Diſpute would have lain purely between Us Two, and have been decided by an Appeal to the Learned Men of our Own Nation: but I find the matter is not likely to reſt here; Dr *Bentley*'s Boaſts of his Correſpondence abroad, and of the Compliments that from thence have been paid him, have made it neceſſary to ſet Him and his Performances in as true a Light towards Foreigners, as they do or will appear in here at Home:

particularly to let Monſieur *Spanheim*, and Monſieur *Grævius* know how miſtaken they have been in placing their Civilities upon One that does not deſerve 'em; and can never be valu'd, but where he is not known.

If therefore I have not made uſe of all the Advantages againſt Dr *Bentley*, which he has given me, nor diſplay'd Him fully in all his Colours, thoſe Defects, I hope, will ſoon be ſupply'd by a Better Hand, that intends to do right to the Subject, and to the Dr's Character, in a Tongue that will laſt longer, and go further: for ſince Dr *Bentley* has *appeal'd* to *Foreign Univerſities*, to *Forcign Univerſities* he muſt *go*.

Dr

Dr *Bentley*'s Diſſertation UPON THE *Fables of* ÆSOP, EXAMIN'D.

I Had laid together ſome Short Remarks upon the Reſt of the Dr's *Appendix*, which were intended to accompany Theſe: but I ſhall be oblig'd to leave *England* before I can put 'em into Order. However, I cannot part with the Dr, till I have given him my Thoughts of his Performance on *Æſop*; and examin'd, whether he has any better Grounds for oppoſing his Judgment to Sir *William Temple*'s, in the caſe of the *Fables*, than in that of the *Epiſtles*. I cannot ſtay long enough on the Subject to do right to it; but what I ſhall be able to ſay, will, I hope, ſufficiently prove, that the Reaſonings and Diſcoveries in this latter part of his Work are perfectly of a piece with thoſe we have already had to do with; and, let him diſpute againſt *Phalaris*, or *Æſop*, or

what elſe he pleaſes, that Dr *Bentley* will be Dr *Bentley* ſtill.

Horſets out well — *I am glad*, ſays he, *to find a good part of the Work done ready to my hand. For Monſieur* Bachet, *Sieur de* Meziriac, * *has writ the Life of Æſop in French.* Which Life the Reader now ſuppoſes that Dr *Bentley* has read, and found to agree exactly with his own Sentiments; but to his Surprize 'twill appear, that the Dr has neither read it, nor ſeen it: for in the Next Line he confeſſes that he *could never meet with it.* So that he finds his Work done to his hands in a Book that he has not yet found: Books Loſt, and Books not yet come to his View, are as inſtructive to Him as any Books in his Study. There is no dealing with ſuch a Profound Scholar as this, who is as well read in what he has not ſeen, as in what he has. But perhaps here, as in Other caſes, he has his accounts at Second Hand: not ſo neither, he is purely upon the Conjecture; and *can gueſs from the great Learning of the Author known to him by his Other Works, that he has in a manner exhauſted the Subject.* That is, by his Mathematical Notes upon *Diophantus* he can *gueſs* what he ſays upon *Æſop*'s Fables. But, methinks, 'tis a little nicely gueſs'd, that *Meziriac* has *in a manner exhauſted* the Subject: why ſhould not a Man that had written ſo well upon *Diophantus*, have *quite* exhauſted it? I begin now to gueſs ſomething too; and may be able to make out my Gueſs e're I am a Month Older: I am going into a Country where *Meziriac* is, I ſuppoſe, to be had; and when I have ſeen him, perhaps I ſhall find, that Dr *Bentley* has

* Diſſert. p. 35.

ſeen

ſeen him too —— tho' he has forgotten it. For he pretends to preſent us here *only with ſuch Things as have eſcap'd the Obſervation of Others*; and I now know him ſo well, that I ſuſpect him a-Courſe whenever he ſets up for Diſcoveries. The Buſineſs of *Ocellus* has given us One Remarkable Inſtance of this kind; and this ſmall Piece we are upon will preſently, even without the help of *Meziriac*, afford us Another.

The firſt of his *few looſe Things which he fancies have eſcap'd the Obſervation of Others*, is, *that 'tis very uncertain if* (he would ſay *whether*) *Æſop himſelf left any Fables behind him in Writing*. This Hint has I believe eſcap'd the Obſervation of Others: for they that have obſerv'd any thing about it have obſerv'd the contrary. The Phraſe of Antiquity is the ſame when they mention any thing of *Æſop*'s, as it would have been, had they thought *Æſop* really to have wrote it; the Ancients quote him juſt as they do Other Authors: when *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Ariſtophanes*, *Plutarch*, *Galen*, *Themiſtius*, *Gellius* cite any thing from him, 'tis ὡς ἔτυ, ὡς ἔφασκε, ὡς ἔλεγε, καὶ ἡ Αἴσωπου, καὶ ἡ Αἰσώπε μῦθον, *inquit*, &c: and how would they have expreſs'd themſelves otherwiſe, if *Æſop*'s Writings had confeſſedly lain before them? Dr *Bentley* ſure will not be ſo Captious as to ſay, that theſe Forms of Speech are not expreſs enough; among all Authors that quote from others, ὡς ἔφη and ὡς ἔγραψεν, are Equivalent, and us'd indifferently. Biſhop *Pearſon* has largely prov'd this, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* *, againſt *Daillé*, who laid hold of this Cavil to diſparage the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*:

* Par. 1. p. 83.

And

And I the rather referr the Dr to that Incomparable Work, because *he confesses with some Shame, that he had either never read it, or utterly forgot it* *. A good account of his Acquaintance with One of the First Books in the World, in the Way of his Profession! They that read Books at this rate, will be sure to write Books that will be so read. But not to forget our business — The Word ἔγραψεν it self is apply'd to *Æsop*, as an Author, by *Suidas*, *Aphthonius* (*a*), and others: What *Suidas* says deserves a Reflection; his Words are (*b*), Æsop *wrote Two Books of what befel him at* Delphos; *but Others are rather of Opinion that he wrote nothing but Fables* (*c*). So that tho' some doubted whether he wrote any account of what happen'd to him at *Delphos*, yet, according to *Suidas*, no-body doubted but that he wrote Fables. *Eustathius* calls him expressly not λογοποιὸς only, but μυθογράφος; expounding the one by the other †. The Words too of the Old Scholiast on *Aristophanes* are so full, I think, as not easily to be eluded; ὁ Αἴσωπος, says he, ἐν τοῖς μύθοις τὰ αὐτὰ λέγει (*d*). That Few say in Terms, he was a Writer, is because No-body had any Suspicions to the contrary: and when the Doubt was not started, nor thought of, there was no need to guard against it. I have produc'd some Ancients that say, he *did* write; Dr *Bentley* does not pretend to instance in any that say, he *did not*: instead

* Dissert. p. 113.

(*a*) Ἄριστα πάντων συγγράψαι τοὺς μύθους· Πρόγυμν·

(*b*) Ἔγραψε τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς αὐτῷ συμβάντα ἐν βιβλίοις βιμᾶλλον δὲ τινὲς φασὶ † Αἴσωπον Ἀποκρίματα γεγραφέναι μόνον.

(*c*) *Suidas* explains ἀποκρίματα by λόγους, in that very place.

† Ad initium Iliadis A.

(*d*) Sch. in *Plut.* 1124

ſtead of that, his beſt Arguments for this New Point are theſe that follow.

The Old Man in Ariſtophanes (ſays he *) *learnt his Fables in converſation*, ἐμαθεν ἐν συμποσίοις in which of his Dictionaries does συμπόσιον ſignifie *Converſation*? Or is it neceſſary that what was learnt at a *Feaſt* muſt be learnt in *Converſation*? might it not be a part of their Feſtival Entertainments, to have ſome agreeable Book read to them? and might not *Æſop* ſometimes be that Book? If this might be the Caſe, then the Old man might learn his Fables at a Feaſt, and yet learn 'em out of a Book too. But ſuppoſe he did not, allowing that he learnt 'em in Converſation; what follows from hence? that becauſe the Fables of *Æſop* were in every-bodys Mouth, and told at their Meals, by way of entertainment, *therefore* there was no written Collection of 'em, they were preſerv'd all by Memory. If this be Criticiſing, I am ſure, Criticiſing has nothing to do with Reaſoning. By the ſame way of Deduction will I prove, that we have not a *Written Creed* now, nor ever had one: for have not all People from the Riſe of Chriſtianity down to this Time learnt it, without the help of a Book? and is it not plain therefore that the Creed is preſerv'd by Memory only, and has never been committed to Writing?

* P. 136.

The Dr produces a Second Paſſage in *Ariſtophanes*, where one man reproaches anothers Ignorance thus, οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πώποτε, *You have not read ſo much as* Æſop; for ſo he himſelf tranſlates it: *from whence*, he ſays, *one might conclude that* Æſop *wrote his Own Fables.* If they

they were his *Own* Fables, one might pretty safely conclude that he *wrote* 'em; for those *Writings* are the most properly a man's *Own*, which he *writes*. But Dr *Bentley*, it seems, concludes from this very Passage, (I cannot imagine How) that *Æsop* did not write 'em. Till he tells us by what Wonderful Means he got to this Conclusion, I can say nothing to it. But as for his Occasional and Weighty Debate, whether or no οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας be a Proverbial Saying *spoken of Illiterates* *, I can see no manner of reason why it was brought in here, but meerly for the pleasure of contradicting *Erasmus* and *Scaliger*: Proverb, or no Proverb, I think, it equally proves that there were Fables at that time, which went under the Name of *Æsop*; and what advantage can be made of this, must be against Dr *Bentley*.

* Dissert. p. 136.

The Closing Argument, that winds these Proofs up into a Demonstration is a Passage in *Plato*'s *Phædo*, where *Socrates* says †: *Among the Fables of* Æsop *I had at hand, and remember'd* *, *I put those into Verse that first occurr'd to me*: from whence the Dr shrewdly observes, *that* Socrates *does not say that he made use of a Book of Fables*: and from his not saying so would have us believe that there was no such thing as a Book of *Æsop*'s Fables in *Socrates*'s time. *Socrates* was now in Prison, and in obedience to a Divine Admonition thought himself oblig'd to do something in Poetry: he pitch'd upon *Æsop*, putting into Verse such of his Fables as occurr'd to him; and, if we may guess by what we

† οὓς προχείρους εἶχον, καὶ ἠπιστάμην μύθους τοὺς Αἰσώπου, τούτων ἐποίησα οἷς πρώτοις ἐνέτυχον.

* Or, *knew to be His.*

we have left of his doing, such Fables occurr'd to him as were nearest his Own Case. Now what need was there of having recourse to a Written *Æsop* for that which he and every body remember'd? or what wonder was it, that he had not the Book by him in Prison? why, we are not sure that at the particular point of time when he did these Fables in Prison, he had so much as *Pen and Ink* allow'd him.

This is what might be said, supposing ἠπιστάμην to signifie, *remember'd*, as Dr *Bentley* translates it: but, with his leave, I think the Marginal sense I have given of the word is the truer, and that the Passage ought to be thus rendred, *Among the Fables of* Æsop *I had at hand, and knew to be his*, &c. for otherwise, there will be Three * expressions in this short sentence, that signifie much the same thing, over and over agen: a fault in writing, which Dr *Bentley* might easily fall into, but *Plato* hardly could And if this be the true translation of the Words, they plainly, I think, imply, that *Socrates did make use of a Book of Fables*; whereas our Critic produces 'em to shew, he did not.

* προχείρους εἶχον, ἠπιστάμην, οἷς πρώτοις ἐνέτυχον.

Of the Three Passages then, which he has brought to prove *Æsop* no Author, Two of 'em †, if they prove any thing, prove directly the contrary: and the Other * proves nothing, but that Dr *Bentley* has read somebody, that has read *Aristophanes*.

† δ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας· οὓς προχείρους εἶχον &c.

This is the Irresistible Evidence, with which Dr *Bentley* has taken upon him to confront the Opinion of Two Thousand Years; such Evidence as one would not admit against *Simmias Rhodius*, to rob him of the honour of his

* ἔμαθεν ἐν συμποσίῳ.

Egg,

Egg, or his *Hatcher*. Is it fit, that Men ſhould make uſe of their little Skill in Letters, their Conjectures, their Fancies, their Dreams, to attack the Reputation of our firſt Maſters in good writing? is it grateful with ſuch groundleſs Suſpicions as theſe to fall upon the Father of Moral Fable, whoſe happy way of conveying knowledge has been ever ſpoken of with ſo much Reſpect, and been of ſuch ſtanding Uſe to Mankind? Has Dr *Bentley* ſworn to be at defiance, with every man that writes Maſterly in his way? Sir *William Temple*, I believe could not be better pleas'd than in being affronted in ſo very Good Company. Let me tell our Critic, what I have heard from Wiſe Men, that Confidence and Paradoxes are not the true way to a Laſting Reputation; that the firſt point of Modeſty and Senſe is, never to Contradict the whole World Needleſly, and the next to that, to be ſure never to do it but upon very good Grounds.

The Dr often gives me an Occaſion to put him in mind of this Truth; and more than Once in the very Paſſage we are upon: where he has laid hold of a Careleſs Expreſſion in *Laertius* (a Writer of his Own Form) to oppoſe *Plato*'s Account of *Socrates*, or rather *Socrates*'s Account of himſelf. *Laertius*, he ſays, *ſeems to hint that* Socrates *did but* One *Fable*: and this ſeeming Shadow of an Hint, even from *Laertius*, is to bear down the Expreſs Authority of *Plato*, who ſays he did Several *. The very Spirit of *Athenæus* is got into him, who † undertook to diſprove ſome of the moſt Remarkable Particulars of *Socrates*'s Life recorded in *Xenophon* and *Plato*, by the very

* *See the Paſſage before quoted* p. 236.

† L. 2. c. 15.

very ſame *Negative* Way of Arguing, that Dr *Bentley* makes uſe of againſt *Phalaris* and *Æſop*; the *Silence and Pretermiſſion of Authors* (*a*); nay, and expreſſes himſelf in the ſame Mannerly Way too, calling *Plato*, the beſt-bred Man in the World, *Dog* and *Lyar*; covertly indeed, whereas Dr *Bentley* has beſtow'd much the ſame Titles (*b*) on thoſe He diſputes againſt, bluntly and openly. But the Impartial *Caſaubon* takes the part of thoſe Great Men againſt his Author; reproves his Rudeneſs, and confutes his Reaſonings; and ſhews him to be, as Confident Clowns generally are, all over miſtaken (*c*). The Men of Letters, I hope, will excuſe this Freedom; No man is readier than I am to value *Athenæus* for what he ought to be valu'd, the *Fragments* and *Remains* of Antiquity which he has preſerv'd: but to ſee him inſolently trampling on Great Names, is what I cannot bear without Indignation.

(*a*) Differ. p. 64.

(*b*) Leucon *carries one thing, and his* Aſs *another.* P. 74. —*ſomething uſeful to a* Lyar *beſides a pretty Invention* —— p. 17.

(*c*) *Dr* Bentley *has ventured to make uſe of theſe very Exploded Arguments of* Athenæus, *to diſcredit* Socrates's *Epiſtles; and uſhers 'em in with this Glorious Character,* Among other Errors in Chronology for which *Athenæus* chaſtiſes *Plato.* Diſſ. p. 93.

I need no Tranſition from hence to Dr *Bentley*; who taking it now for granted, that Æſop *did not write his Own Fables*, will tell us Who wrote 'em for him. *Demetrius Phalereus* he thinks to have been *the firſt that committed them to Writing* *: And if Others ſhould think that he was not the Firſt, they would have ſomewhat better Ground for their Thought than He has; for, without inſiſting on the Paſſage

* P. 138.

in

in *Plato*, they have *Aristophanes*, and his *Scholiast* (either of whose Words may be taken in this case, I hope, a little sooner than Dr *Bentley*'s) to countenance their Opinion. *Aristophanes*, in the Passage mention'd by Dr *Bentley*, plainly intimates, that there was a Book of *Æsop*'s Fables in *His* time; and *His* Time was before *Demetrius*'s. Οὐδ' Αἰσωπου πεπάτηκας, is, *ne Æsopum quidem legisti*: thus the Scholiast interprets it; πεπάτηκας, ἀντὶ τῦ ἀνέγνως; thus the use of the word πεπάτηκας in other Authors ‖ proves it *ought* to be translated; and, which is more than all, Dr *Bentley* himself has thus render'd it, *You have not read so much as Æsop.* How could *Æsop* be *read* at a time, when he supposes, that there was no Collection of *Æsop*'s Fables *committed to writing*? It happens indeed now and then, that Books are *written* without being *Read* (Some of Dr *Bentley*'s Works will be a Proof of this) but it can never happen, I presume, that any Book should be *read*, without being *written*. There is another Passage in *Aristophanes*'s Εἰρήνη, where, speaking of the Eagle, he has these Words,

‖ Plato, *in his* Phædrus, *has employ'd it just in this manner*, ἀλλὰ μὴν τόγε Τρωίαν αὐτὸν πεπάτηκας ἀκριβῶς· p. 273. *i. e.* Tisiam ipsum accuratè trivisti, perlegisti. Serranus *has mistaken the Sense of it, and translated it*, Graviter pessum dedisti.

Ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου Λόγοις ἐξηυρέθη
Μόνῳ πτερωτῶν εἰς Θεὰς ἀφιγμένῳ.

The Fable he referrs to is that of *the Eagle and the Beetle*, which is in the present Collection; and I think he manifestly quotes a Collection of Fables extant in His Time: I'm sure,

ſure, had he intended to quote ſuch a Collection, he could not have us'd Words that would more plainly have expreſs'd his Meaning. To return to my point therefore, if there was a *Written Æſop* in *Ariſtophanes*'s time, then *Demetrius Phalereus* could not be *the firſt who committed Æſop's Fables to Writing.*

All the mention we have of this Performance of *Demetrius* is in his *Laertius*, who ſays it was call'd Ἀισωπεια, and Αἰσωπείων Λόγων Συναγωγαὶ; by which it *ſeems* to Dr *Bentley*, that *they were in Proſe*; and if it ſhould *ſeem* to anybody elſe, that they were in Verſe, they have juſt as much Reaſon for their Fancy, as he has: unleſs by his Divining Faculty, he can, from the *Titles* being in Proſe, ſmell out that the *Work* was ſo. *Some*, he ſays, *may imagine, that they are the Same that are now extant*: Some! who? not *Meziriac* I hope, becauſe he has not ſeen him. But whoever theſe ſome be, Dr *Bentley* is againſt 'em. *I wiſh* (ſays he) *they were* [the ſame that are now extant] *for then they would be well writ with ſome Genius and Spirit* (*a*). How are we to take him? Would *Demetrius*'s Fables have been better than they were, if they had been ſtill extant? or would the Fables that are extant, and by ſome aſcrib'd to *Demetrius*, be better than they are, if *Demetrius* had wrote 'em? Had Dr *Bentley* wiſh'd that *Demetrius*'s Fables were ſtill extant, it had been a Kind Wiſh, becauſe *Demetrius* is thought a better Writer than He that compos'd theſe Fables: but to wiſh *Demetrius*'s *the ſame that are now extant*, is to wiſh his Fables no better written, nor with more *Genius* or *Spirit*, than thoſe we have.

(*a*) Differ. p. 138.]

Whom have we now after *Demetrius*? why, *Some-body*, that wrote the Μυθικὰ, and might, for ought any-body knows, be before him. For *Suidas*, the only Man the Dr finds that mentions these Μῦθικὰ, giving no Intimation of the Author's Age, we are utterly at a loss where to fix him; unless Dr *Bentley* can help us out here, and by looking into his Mouth tell us of what Age his Greek is. Probably he was of no One Age; the Μῦθοι or Μυθικὰ in Verse, like our Present Collection in Prose, were, 'tis natural to think, made up from several Authors that wrote in several Times; amongst which *Babrius* himself (the next Author he mentions) might have but a Share, tho' a very large one. (*b*): for we find him often quoted together with, and as it were under the Common Title of μῦθοι or μυθικὰ (*c*); and by the bye, not to *Scazons* only, but *Hexameters* too (†); which, if it were a Mistake of *Suidas*, might probably arise from his finding him mix'd with the Other Writers of the Μυθικὰ: but I am very unwilling to think it a Mistake, because the Verses are fine ones, and worthy of *Babrius*. Whether this Guess of mine be right or no, 'tis somewhat better founded than the Dr's, who judges these μυθικὰ to

(*b*) Βιβλία δέκα, says *Suidas*.

(*c*) Βάβριος μύθους ἤτοι μυθικά. *Suidas* in Χορίαμβος. Βάβριος ἐν τοῖς μυθικοῖς· *Suidas* in κνηκίας. Βαβρίας, μύθους ἤτοι μυθιάμβους· *Suidas* in Βαβρίας· Βάβριος ἐν Μυθικοῖς· *Suidas* in Νέμεσις·

(†) Θέντο μετ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἑταιρείην μύε δοίω,
Οὐ καθομὰ ζώοντες· ὁ μὲν κατὰ νειὸν ἐρήμην
Ἐτρέφετ', ὃς δὲ δόμοισιν ἐν ἀφνειῶν τρέφετ' ἀνδρῶν·
Suidas in ἑταιρείην·

to have been written all in *Elegiac* Verſe, *becauſe* he finds under this Title Two Pentameters quoted; and beſides, in Three different Places, Three Hexameters, which might have no Pentameters after them; and (to ſtrengthen his Inference yet farther) another Inſtance of Two Hexameters together. This the Reader will find to be a true State of the Caſe, if he will take the trouble of conſulting the Paragraph, where this New Thought is in as New a Manner ſurprizingly well handl'd.

I had like here to have overlook'd One Conſiderable Branch of the Dr's Diſcovery, where he informs us, that theſe Fragments of the Μυθικὰ *belong to the* Æſopic *Fables, which*, he ſays, *has not yet been obſerv'd, that he knows of* (*a*). I believe no-body ever read theſe Fragments but obſerv'd it; however they kept their Obſervation to themſelves, becauſe they knew no-body could read 'em without obſerving it. For to what elſe could Fragments of Fables written after the manner of *Æſop* belong, but to the *Æſopic* Fables? which Title is known to comprehend not only the Fables ſuppos'd to have been written by *Æſop* himſelf; but all Others, fram'd after his Model. (*a*) Diſſert. p. 136.

The Reader remembers, that *after Demetrius* came *Some-body*, who might as well, for any thing we know of his Time, have come *before* him. Now after this *Some-body* comes *One Babrius* *, who has the advantage indeed of our Laſt Author in having a Name, and no otherwiſe: for his Time is equally a Secret to us. *Avienus*, 'tis true, by the Order he has plac'd him in, ſeems to think he was before * Diſſert. p. 140.

Phædrus; but how little, or how long before, no body can determin. So that this *Babrius*, that liv'd we don't know When, comes after an Author we don't know Who, and equally living we don't know When.

The Chronology of *Babrius* being thus settl'd, the Dr proceeds to his Character; and says, he was *a Writer of Size and Quality*: I agree with him in his Meaning, tho' his Wording of it be a little Particular. *Babrius* was indeed, as far as we can guess by the Small Remains we have of him, a very valuable Author, and deserv'd to have liv'd as well as *Phædrus* himself: He has not been lost so long as *Phædrus* was; may he be recover'd as entire! His Draughts are all Natural, his Expression Lively, and his Turn of Verse Numerous and Proper. But the Dr has by no means done right to his Character in the Instances he has given us to Judge him by; which are cited imperfectly Both, and the Last of 'em extreamly to his disadvantage. The First, about the *Sick Lyon*, which the Dr. has thus quoted,

—— οἷά τις νούσῳ
Κάμνων ἐβέβλητ', οὐκ ἀληθὲς ἀσθμαίνων·

he may please thus to supply,

Οἴκοι ἔσω σπήλυγγος (*) οἷά τις νούσῳ
Κάμνων ἐβέβλητ' &c.

To the next, Φρίξας δ' χαίτην ἔκθορε φωλάδος κοίλης,
He may add these Two Beautiful Verses.

Κοι-

(*) Suidas *in* σπήλυγξ, *where* κοιώσω *is, I suppose, a Corruption of* οἴκοι ἔσω.

Κοιμωμένε Λέοντος, ἀχρεῖος χαίτη
Διέδεσμε (†) μῦς· ὁ δὲ Λέων ἐθυμώθη·
Φρίξας δὲ χαίτην &c. *Suid.* in φριξότριχα.

and this (to his Eternal Scandal be it ſpoken) is a Plain Proof that he has not read over all *Suidas*. Nay, I have reaſon to ſuſpect, that he is got no further than Κάππα, which I obſerve here to be the utmoſt Line of his Citations. I would not have the Reader ſlight this Diſcovery of mine, for 'tis as conſiderable as any of Dr *Bentley*'s, that are purely his own.

To oblige Our Critic, who is ſo fond of New Hints, I will ſuggeſt One to him, that he may, if he pleaſes, improve at his Leiſure. In the *Scholia* on *Thucydides* (*p.* 266.) there is a Paſſage quoted, ἐκ μέσου τοῦ Αἰσώπου μύθων; and the words of it are,

——ἄλλος ἄλλον ἀγρεῦσαι θέλων
Τρέχει πυκ, ἄλλος ἄλλον ἐκ κακοῦ σῴζων.

Now here's a New Author for Dr *Bentley*, one that writ Fables alternately in Scazons and Iambicks; or here's a Proof at leaſt that *Babrius* (whoſe Verſes theſe ſeem to be) did not write all his Fables in Scazons unmix'd: which may alſo be further confirm'd from this paſſage in *Suidas* *, quoted by him out of *Babrius*, ἐκ ἄνθρωποι ἔδοξαν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ δαίμονες παλαμναῖοί τινες; for it runs naturally into theſe Verſes,

——ἐκ ἔδοξαν ἄνθρωποι
Εἶναι, ἀλλὰ δαίμονες παλαμναῖοί τινες·

* in παλαμναῖος.

I ſug-

(†) *The ſtrict Meaſure of the Verſe requires that it ſhould be* διέδεσμαν. *But the Painting is more Lively, according to the Preſent Numbers.*

I ſuggeſt this Thought to the Dr to enrich his Diſſertation with, when he puts it into Latin. After he has done ſo, Some-body perhaps may ſhew him, that 'tis founded on a Miſtaken Reading of thoſe two Paſſages; but till then, I ſhall leave 'em as I found 'em.

After theſe Light Skirmiſhes, Dr *Bentley* comes at laſt to his Main Point, pretty early, I thank him; for he is not yet got quite Half way in his Remarks (that ſhould be) upon *Æſop*. He now draws all his Forces againſt the Preſent Sett; and his arguments, I find, (making allowance for a few Straglers, which I ſhall fetch into their Ranks) march in this Order. Firſt he attempts to prove That Parcel of the Preſent Sett which *Nevelet* put
(*a*) § VI. out, to be younger than *Æſop* (*a*); in the next
(*b*) § VII. place, that it is even *recenter than Babrius* (*b*): and laſtly, that the Other Parcel of 'em, which he aſcribes to *Planudes*, is yet Younger
(*c*) § VIII. than *Nevelet*'s (*c*).

Upon the Firſt Article he performs very notably; he is to detect the whole CXXXVI to be Spurious: Now would I willingly Compound for the Odd XXXVI (if our Critic will give me leave to call an Even Number ſo); but How Many do You think he has diſprov'd? No leſs than *One*! and here endeth this Argument.

Not being able to proceed any farther here, he draws back, and falls once again upon his Firſt Preliminary, that *Æſop wrote no Fables*; which, having now waded deep in the Controverſie, he clearly perceives, becauſe the CXCIII[d] is told by *Ariſtotle* differently from what it is in *Æſop*, and in *Lucian* differently from

from what it is in *Aristotle*. Now here's a Long Chain of desperate Consequences; for if Dr *Bentley* has prov'd any thing, he has prov'd Ten times more than he is aware of. If *Æsop* did not write this Fable, because *Aristotle* gives different Circumstances of it; then neither did *Aristotle* write it, because *Lucian*'s Account of it is as different from His, as His is from *Æsop*'s. Nay, according to Dr *Bentley*, neither has *Lucian* told this Fable, tho' we find it in his Works; because it is otherwise told in our present Sett, which the Dr supposes written by a Man more Modern than He. All that can be gather'd from the Little Varieties in the same Fable is, that they who had occasion to tell it, went no further than their Memory for it, where the Main of the Fable, and as much as was for their purpose, lay. And as for the Nice Circumstances of it, they either mistook 'em by accident, or thought they could vary 'em for the better.

This Digression has kindly supply'd the Room of his First Attempt; in the Next, he endeavours at something that is really to his Purpose; and if his Proof were *Full*, and were his *Own*, I for my part should thank him for the Discovery: but as it is neither, I shall take the liberty to shew both That and Him in their Proper Colours, and to do Justice to the Dead whom he has pillag'd.

His Pretence, and his Words are, that *the Author of the Parcel which was publish'd by* Neveletus *did nothing else but Epitomize* Babrius, *and put him into Prose* (*a*). Granting he didn't, whom are we to thank for this thought? (*a*) Differ. p. 143.

Dr *Bentley* says, Himself; for He *discover'd it* (*a*). But there's an Honest Editor of the Dr's Acquaintance, a Man of a Fair Character, and who has not yet been convicted of any Trick, that puts in for the Discovery: let us hear what he says, and what the Dr can answer to it.

(*a*) Ibid. p. 142.

Nevelet. *A Discovery*, at this time of day! why, I found it out *Fourscore* Years ago, and publish'd it to all the World in my Edition of *Æsop*.

Dr *Bentley.* What care I for Your Edition? I found it out my self.

Nev. Not care for my Edition! You constantly referr to't, and make use on't, and quote my Preface (*b*): don't all your Dispute turn upon *Nevelet*'s Parcel? how can You pretend Ignorance?

(*b*) P. 141.

Bent. I pretend to publish *such Things only as have escap'd the Observation of Others*; I have done so, and I'll stand to't.

Nev. Stand to what You will, 'tis My Observation, and I'll *unmask* You. Have not I said, after quoting a Scazon out of the Prose-Fables, *Redolent hæc ut plurima alia harum Fabularum Versus Iambicos: atq; utinam exstarent hi Versus unde hæc desumpta sunt*; Babriam *ipsum, quantum video, Integrum haberemus, cujus jam Umbram tantùm & Epitomen habemus* (*c*). What have You said more than this comes to?

(*c*) Not. in Fab. 157

Bent. Yes; I don't call 'em, as You do, barely *Iambicks*, I call 'em *Choliambicks*, and *Scazons*: besides, You speak doubtfully, *redolent hæc, ut plurima alia, Versus Iambicos*; but I speak positively, My Expressions are, *There are most Visible*

sible Footsteps, This is a manifest turning out of Choliambicks; Who doesn't discover here a Scazon?

Nev. You have indeed a Peculiar Way of Speaking; but what else have You added to my Discovery, besides Confidence? You endeavour what You can to disguise what You take from me; but after all, there appears upon you here and there *not only a Sameness of Sense, but a Sameness of Words too, which could not fall out by Accident* *: and this is Your Own Way of tracing a Plagiary, The most Remarkable Hint of mine, *Cujus jam EPITOMEN habemus*, don't you translate it literally, and say, that the Author of that Parcel did nothing but *EPITOMIZE Babrius?*

* Dissert. p. 36.

Bent. I don't go upon Hints; I have demonstrated, 'tis my Thought, by shewing the very manner in which I found it out. *I discover'd it by this means; I observ'd in 'em several Passages, that were not of a Piece with the rest, but had a Turn and Composition plainly Poetical, as in the* CCLXIII[d] *Fable, which begins thus,* Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα χωλὸς ἐστήκει· *This I saw was a Choliambic Verse* (*a*).

(*a*) Disser. p. 143.

Nev. I know where you saw it; 'twas in my Notes upon this Fable, where I have these Words, Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα &c. *Versus Iambicus Scazon* —

Bent. But I improve upon this, and say — *I presently suspected that the Writer had taken this out of* Babrius.

Nev. That's the very Translation of my Words, that follow,— *Quales* Babrias *scripsit, nec satis scio num* Babriæ *ipsius.* Now, suppose You

You had obſerv'd ſeveral Footſteps of Scazons in the Fables, is it credible that You ſhould take Your Firſt Hint from that very Fable I did, which comes ſo Late in the Book (*b*); when the ſame Hint might as well have been taken from ſeveral Fables before it? Come, come, Dr, this bears hard upon You; the Footſteps of *Babrius* are not near ſo plain in the Fables, as the Footſteps of my Notes are in Your Remarks.

(*b*) Fab. CCLXIII

Bent. I tread in No man's Footſteps; 'tis well known, I have declar'd loudly againſt *Filching*; *do you think I'd turn Filcher* my Self? *Foreign Profeſſors* know me better.

Nev. Vizzanius, and I, know You better than They do; and the World in a little time ſhall know You as Well as We do. You thought You might ſafely injure the Dead; but the Living ſhall do us Right upon You, ſtrip You of all Your borrow'd Plumes, and return 'em to their ſeveral Owners: You may read Your Fate out of theſe Verſes of *Virgil.*

His Bentlejus *ovat Spoliis, gaudétq; potitus.*
Neſcia Mens hominum Fati, Sortiſq; futuræ;
Et ſervare modum rebus ſublata ſecundis!
Illi tempus erit, magno cùm optaverit emptum
Intactum Neveletum, *& cùm Spolia iſta, diémq;*
Oderit ——

The Caſe between *Nevelet* and Dr *Bentley* is fairly repreſented in this Dialogue; and if any-body ſtill thinks that the Dr ſtruck out this Hint purely by his own *Sagacity*, I'm ſure I ſhall take no further Pains to convince him; but go on to examine, how far the Diſcovery reaches.

Dr

Dr *Bentley* has instanc'd in *Six* Several Fables, in which he finds the Traces of *Babrius*'s Scazons. In the *Two* First he has pretty good Colour for what he says; because *Suidas* has preserv'd Three Scazons of *Babrius*, the Words of which are most of 'em to be found in these Two Fables, and very near in the same Order. In the *Four* next he does not go upon so good Grounds; but indulges his Fancy, without having the Authority of *Suidas* to back him in it. He finds out some Words that will run into Scazons, or Pieces of Scazons; and, without any more ado, concludes from thence, that These were design'd for Scazons, and those Scazons were *Babrius*'s. That the Two first of the Four have something of a Poetical Turn I agree with him; particularly the Conclusion of the Second, methinks, is Noble, and not unbecoming *Babrius*.

—— φαῖνε, Αὔχνε, καὶ σίγα·
Τῶν ἀστέρων τὸ φέγγος οὔποτ' ἐκλείπει·

The Rest are so Flat, and so Unmusical, that I can scarce ever think 'em design'd for Verses; or if they were, yet I have too great a Regard for *Babrius*, to think 'em His. Others beside *Babrius* might happen to turn a Fable the same way; Dr *Bentley* ought to know, that *Callimachus* did so. As for One of 'em, the CLXV^th^, Dr *Bentley* very unluckily pitches upon it, to prove it transpros'd from *Babrius*. It begins in the Prose, Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύο ἐρωμένας εἶχεν, ὧν μὲν μία νεᾶνις, ἡ δ' ἄλλη πρεσβύτις, which the Dr supposes to have been in *Babrius*, thus,

Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δυ' ἐρωμένας εἶχεν,
Ὧν ἡ μὲν ἦν νεᾶνις, ἡ δὲ πρεσβύτις·

A Good

A Good Judge of these things easily perceives, that the First of these Verses has nothing Harmonious in the Numbers, or Poetical in the Expression of it; and would conclude therefore that this Fable was not taken from *Babrius*'s Scazons, tho' he had no other Evidence of it. But it happens, that Two Verses, truly *Babrius*'s, and relating to this Fable, are preserv'd in *Suidas*, which utterly overthrow Dr *Bentley*'s Criticism; for the Wording of 'em does not in the least fall in with That of the Prose. The Verses are,

(a) Τῶν ἓν τριχῶν ἑκάστῳ ἡ μὲν ἀκμαία
Ἕτεμεν ἂς ἴυρισκε λευκανθιζούσας (b).

(a) *Suid.* in ἑκάστοτε
(b) *This Last is a Corrupt Reading.*

If the Prose Fable had trac'd *Babrius* so nearly in the beginning, it would have carried some Resemblance to him throughout: and therefore in *One* of his *Six* Dr *Bentley* is Evidently mistaken; and must guess again, before he can make up his Number.

In the mean time I desire the Reader to take notice, that there are in *Suidas* Fragments of *Babrius* belonging to above *Twenty* Several Fables; and out of all these Dr *Bentley* has been able to produce but Two that have the least Agreement with our Prose Sett: the Rest are widely different in their Expression, as appears by comparing 'em with the particular Fables to which they belong; which in most Cases may be done with Certainty. Nay, we have One Entire Fable of *Babrius*, about the *Swallow* and *Nightingale*, and another Large Fragment of *Nine Lines*, about *the Priests of Cybele*; and the Fables that answer to these in the Prose are now extant; and are so far from

from resembling *Babrius*'s Verses, that they have scarce a Word the same with 'em. With what Face therefore could Dr *Bentley* produce it *Evidently apparent, that the Author of these Prose Fables did nothing else but Epitomize* Babrius * ? 'Twould be full as good a Consequence, should one say; because we find, that Two or Three Fragments of *Ennius*, are with some little Difference plainly inserted into *Virgil*'s Æneid; *therefore* 'tis *Evident*, that *Virgil* did nothing else but transcribe *Ennius*.

* P. 143.

After Dr *Bentley*'s way of Arguing, I could easily prove, that all *Nevelet*'s Parcel is transpros'd, or (as he would call it) *traduc'd* †, not from Old *Babrius*'s Scazons, but the Modern *Gabrias*'s Iambicks. " That they are more " Recent than *Gabrias*, I discover'd by this " means, I observ'd in 'em some Passages that " had a Poetical Turn, as in the 173d Fable,

† P. 147.

Οὕτως κακῶς ποιοῦσι τοὺς εὐεργέτας·

" This I saw was an Iambic Verse; and (ha- " ving first seen it observ'd in *Nevelet*'s Note " upon this Fable) I presently suspected that " it was taken from *Gabrias*, and was soon " confirm'd in my Judgment: for upon con- " sulting his Version of the Fable, I found " this Verse there. Whence it Evidently ap- " pears, that the Author of this Parcel did " nothing else but enlarge upon this Sorry " Poet, and put him into Prose. I could go on producing Other Instances of the kind, which would make out the Point about *Gabrias* much more clearly and plainly than Dr *Bentley* has made out His about *Babrius*; but I have a greater regard for my Own, and for

for my Reader's Time, than to throw it away upon such Trifles.

'Tis so far from being a Mark of Acuteness to point out a few Scazons or Iambicks in the Compass of a Book, that, on the contrary, 'tis hard to find a page of Greek Prose any where without 'em. *Aristotle* has long ago observ'd for the Greek, and *Tully* for the Latin, that those Languages run naturally into this Sort of Metre: and that 'tis difficult even in Common Discourse to avoid it (*a*). Nay, to shew how little can be made of such Conjectures as These, I dare undertake to find in these Fables any Sort of Verse that Dr *Bentley* shall pitch upon; and many more Verses of Some Sorts, than the Dr has produc'd Scazons. I will give him an Instance or two of this kind, to shew, how very fanciful 'tis possible for a man to be in these matters, with how very small Grounds.

(*a*) Μάλιστα πάντων τῶν μέτρων Ἰαμβεῖα φθέγγονται λέγοντες· Arist. Rhet. l. 3, c. 8.

And agen —— μάλιστα γὰρ λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἐστι· σημεῖον δὲ τοῦτο, πλεῖστα γὰρ ἰαμβεῖα λέγομεν ἐν τῇ κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· Poet. *L.* 1, *C.* 3.

Senarios & Hipponacteos (i. e. *Iambicks and Scazons*) effugere vix possumus; magnam enim partem ex Iambis nostra constat Oratio.

Cic. Orator.

The Fable of *the Fly*, in the Greek Prose runs thus, Μυῖα ἐμπεσοῦσα εἰς χύτραν κρέατος, ἐπειδὴ ὑποπνίγεσθαι ἔμελλεν, ἔφη πρὸς ἑαυτήν, ἀλλ' ἔγωγε καὶ βέβρωκα, καὶ πέπωκα, καὶ λέλουμαι, κἂν ἀποθανῶ, οὐδὲν μέλει μοι· Now 'tis the Easiest thing in the World to resolve these Words into *Hemiiambs*, or *Anacreonticks*, with some Slight Allowances in the Measure.

Μυῖ' ἐμπεσοῦσα χύτρα
. . . . . ἐπειδὴ
Ὑποπνίγεσθ' ἔμελλεν,
. . . . . .

Ἔγωγε

Ἔγωγε μὲν βέβρωκα,
Πέπωκα, καὶ λέλυμαι·
Θανεῖν οὐδὲν μέλει μοι·

And this Conjecture, I might say, is so much the more probable, because not only the Numbers, but even the Humor and Matter of the Fable is Anacreontical.

Agen, in the Fable of *the Nightingale and the Hawk*, we have these Trochaïcks,

Ἀλλ' ἔγωγ' ἄφρων ἂν εἴην,
Εἰ τροφὴν ἐν χερσ' ἑτοίμην &c.

In the Conclusion of the Fable of the *Frogs*, we have these Words,

—— ἂν δὲ
Ὕδωρ ξηρανθῇ, πῶς ἀναβησόμεθα;

Who doesn't see that this Fable was written in Long and Short Verses?

That of the *Lover and his Two Mistresses* is told twice in the Present Collection; in the Parcel printed before *Nevelet* thus, Ἀνήρ τις μέσην ἔχων ἥβην δύο ἔσχεν ἑταίρας, μίαν μὲν γραῦν, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν νέαν· τούτῳ ἡ μὲν γραῦς τὰς μέλανας τρίχας ἔπλεν, ὡς γέροντα τοῦτον θέλουσα· ἡ δὲ νέα τὰς πολιὰς, ἕως ἂν αὐτὸν φαλακρὸν ἐποίησε καὶ ὄνειδος ἁπάντων· Now the greatest part of this will run naturally into Long and Short Verse,

Ἀνὴρ τις . . . . . δὺ ἔσχεν ἑταίρας,
[Τήνγε] μίαν μὲν γραῦν, τὴν ἑτέραν δὲ νέαν·
Τούτῳ δ' ἡ μὲν γραῦς μέλανας τρίχας [ἀιὲν] ἔπλεν
[Ἐκ κεφαλῆς, αὖ θις δ'] ἡ νέα τὰς πολιάς·
. . . . . αὐτὸν φαλακρὸν, καὶ ὄνειδος ἁπάντων·

But

But notwithſtanding theſe near Reſemblances of ſeveral Sorts of Verſe, that are to be met with in our Proſe Fables, I am far from thinking that the Fables in which they are found were written firſt in Anacreontic, Trochaic, or Elegiac Meaſure, and from thence made Proſe; and ſhould any one pretend to prove it from hence, they would engage I think in a Ridiculous Attempt. The Compoſers of theſe Fables might accidentally ſo range their Words as to fall into theſe Meaſures; the Beſt and the Worſt Writers often do ſo, without being aware of it: In Sir *William Temple*'s and Dr *Bentley*'s Engliſh, how many *Blank Verſes* are there, which they themſelves never thought of, or intended? and therefore nothing, I ſay, can be built upon ſuch Vain and Empty Conjectures.

However, ſo well ſatisfied is the Dr with his Performances of this kind, that he triumphantly concludes, *Thus have I prov'd One Half of the Fables that carry the Name of Æſop to be a Thouſand Years more Recent than He* †. His Proof, without any manner of Miſrepreſentation, or Ridicule, ſtands thus.

† Diſſer. p. 146.

" If out of an 136 Fables, *Two*, by leaving " out Some, and putting in Other Words, " and changing the Order of 'em, look like " Two Fragments of *Babrius* preſerv'd in *Suidas*, then 'tis Evident that theſe were tranſpros'd from *Babrius*: and if in *Four more* " there are ſome Reſemblances of Scazons, of " which no Footſteps appear any where elſe, " then theſe alſo were tranſpros'd from Scazons; and thoſe Scazons muſt be *Babrius*'s: " and if the Paſſages in theſe *Six* Fables are

" bor-

" borrow'd from *Babrius*, then the whole " Parcel of an 136 (among which theſe Six " chance to be found) are certainly Later " than *Babrius*: and if they are Later than " *Babrius*, (whoſe Age we certainly know no " more of than that he liv'd before *Avienus*) " then they are certainly above a Thouſand " Years more Recent than *Æſop*.

Having by this Subtle Chain of Conſequences drawn down the Date of Half the Fables a Thouſand Years below *Æſop*, he goes on with the ſame Clearneſs and Strength of Reaſon to prove the Other Half more Modern than They. *That they are not from* Æſop's *Own Hand, we may know, he ſays, from the* LXXth, *of* the Serpent and the Crabfiſh, *which is taken from a* Scolion, *or* Catch, *much older than* Æſop(*a*). That this *Scolion* is Older than *Æſop*, he has, I believe, no manner of Authority to ſay; *Athenæus*, who cites it, intimates nothing of the Age of it; and if it were Older than *Æſop*, might not *Æſop* take Occaſion from it to raiſe a Fable of his Own? So that the Dr's Proof has theſe two ſmall Defects, that the bottom on which he goes is a Precarious Aſſertion, and the Inference he draws from thence wild and unreaſonable.

(*a*) Differt. p. 146.

After this, he objects againſt a New *Beaſt*, and a New *Bird*, to be met with in our preſent Sett, which were utterly unknown to all the Ancient Naturaliſts. As to his *Beaſt*, βάτραχος, 'tis I own a New Sort of Monſter; and ſo New, as not to be met with in the Elder MSS of *Æſop*, nor even in ſeveral of the Modern ones. *Voſſius*'s MS, and Two in the *Bodley-*

Library, instead of βουνεύρῳ πριτυχόντες read βρῶμά τι εὑρόντες: this βρῶμά τι, 'tis likely, might be βοῦν at first, (which may be observ'd throughout the Fables to be the Prey the Lyon generally feeds upon †) and from the Confusion of those Two Words, βοῦν and εὑρόντες, our New Sort of Beast might easily arise.

* From hence the Epithet of βουφάγος· Βουφάγος εἰς κοιλὴν ἀτραπὸν ἵκτο λέων· *Suidas* in βουφάγος·

Perhaps too the Original of the word Βούταλις may be trac'd from the same heedlesness of a Transcriber. It might formerly have been Ὄυταλις, the same with Ὄρταλις, (as ὀυτάλιχος is with ὀρτάλιχος *) and the B, which stood there for the Number of the Fable, being joyn'd to the first word Ὄυταλις, might create this New Species of a Bird.

* Ὀρτάλιχοι, οἱ μήπω πετόμενοι νεοσσοὶ, καὶ οἱ ἀλεκτρυόνες, καὶ κρεμάστραι· *Hesych.* in Ὀρτάλιχοι: for which *Nicander* uses Ὀυτάλιχοι· If κρεμάστραι in *Hesychius* may be interpreted *Aves Pensiles*, Birds *hung up* in Cages, the Wording and Matter of the Fable will fall in very naturally with this Guess about Ὄυταλις; for it begins thus, Βούταλις ἀπό τινος θυρίδος ἐκρέματο—

But whether or no This be the way in which these Words crept into the Text, is not worth insisting upon; it seems plain to me that they sprung from some Corruption of it, since they are not to be met with, that I can find, in any other Author, Ancient or Modern, or in any Other Fable of *Æsop*, but these Two only. And if a Modern Corruption of any place in a Book prove the Book it self Modern, there is no Book but may be prov'd so.

Upon the same false Ground his next Objection about the *Hebraism* is built: instead of

of βοῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, *Vossius*'s MS reads, ἵστασι καὶ διελογίζετο. Dr *Bentley*, who pretends to such a *Sagacity in the way of Critic*, and talks as if he had consulted all the MSS of *Æsop* upon this occasion, should methinks have observ'd these Various Readings, and have had the Skill to make use of 'em.

There are yet Two Fables more in this Sett, which the Dr will prove not to be *Æsop*'s, One, because he finds it word for word almost in *Apthonius* (he means *Aphthonius*): and it may be *Aphthonius* found it word for word before in *Æsop*; and then we are as we were. The Other, he says, is a Paraphrase on the CCLXXXIV^th in *Neveletus*'s Parcel: and why may not that in *Nevelet* be as well an Abridgment of This?

Having laid down these Undeniable Premises, he solidly Concludes thus; *This Collection THEREFORE is more Recent than that Other* †. Never was the poor Particle *therefore* so miserably abus'd; he has mention'd but *Six* Fables out of an *Hundred and fifty*, and has given us no tolerable proof that any One of those Six are Modern; and yet in the Strength of what he has done ventures to pronounce the Whole Sett to be so. Either Dr *Bentley* must be a very Thoughtless Writer, or he must hope to meet with very Thoughtless Readers: and such I am sure they must be, if these ways of arguing pass upon 'em.

† Dissert. p. 147.

What has Our Critic then been doing all this while? he pretends to prove, that the whole *Three hundred Fables are at least a Thousand Years Younger than* Æsop; he has attempted this Proof particularly but upon *Twelve* of

them; and that in a very Weak Inconcluſive manner. However, ſhould I give him up theſe *Twelve*, and add *Two hundred* more to the account, and allow all theſe to have been Later than *Æſop*; yet ſtill there are Enow left to ſupport Their Pretences, who make *Æſop* an Author, and take Some of theſe Fables to be Originals of His Compoſing. Nobody imagin'd that All, or Half the Fables, that have gone under the Name of *Æſop*, are His; or that Any of 'em almoſt are in the very ſame Words and Syllables, that they were in, when they came out of His hands. They have doubtleſs undergone ſome more, ſome leſs Alterations: but if under all theſe Changes ſtill the Same Little Story in its Chief Circumſtances, and the ſame Simplicity in telling it; the ſame Humorous Turn of Thought, and in good meaſure the ſame Words too have been preſerv'd; there is Enough of *Æſop* left, whereby we may make a true Judgment of his Spirit and Genius, and manner of Performance. When Dr *Bentley* ſhall clearly have made out, either that None of theſe Fables came from *Æſop* himſelf; or, if they did, yet that in the very Form and Caſt of 'em, as well as the Expreſſion, they have been ſince ſo totally alter'd, that they deſerve not to be call'd the Same; it will then be time enough to own, that we are unable to judge of *Æſop*'s merit by any thing in the Preſent Collection: but till that is done, we may ſafely enjoy our Opinions, and They that have admir'd *Æſop*, may venture to go on, and admire him ſtill.

All

All that Dr *Bentley* has hitherto offer'd upon the ſubject of *Æſop* is ſo ſlight and inconſiderable, that one would naturally imagine it to be his *Own*, and believe him when he ſays, that he intended to give us nothing, but what had *eſcap'd the Obſervation of others* *: and yet 'tis certain that Nothing almoſt which he has ſaid could eſcape the Obſervation of any man that look'd into *Nevelet*; in whoſe Preface, and Short Notes, the very ſame Remarks are made, without any thing of the Oſtentation and Ill reaſoning that here accompanies 'em. The Reader will know whether I have injur'd Dr *Bentley* in this Imputation, after he has given himſelf the trouble of viewing the following Accounts, wherein I have compar'd *Nevelet*'s Old Obſervations with Dr *Bentley*'s New Ones.

* Diſſert. *p.* 135.

Sect. I. Dr *Bentley* obſerves, that One in *Ariſtophanes* tells another, that he is unlearn'd and unacquainted with *Æſop*, τὸν Αἴσωπον οὐκ ἐπίστασαι.

Unde eſt Ariſtophanicum *Convitium*, τὸν Αἴσωπον οὐκ ἐπίστασαι.

Nev. Præf. *p.* 2.

Sect. II. Socrates *eſſay'd to put the* Æſopic *Fables into Verſe.*

Socrates Æſopi *Fabulas dignas judicavit quas Verſibus includeret.* Id. ibid.

Sect. V. *Afterwards came one* Babrius, *that gave a New Turn to the Fables into Choliambic Verſe.* Suid. in Βάβριος.

De Gabria *itidem eſt ut moneam, ſcripſit Ille Iambico metro eius generis quod eſt* ἐπὶ σκάζοντων, *ut* Suidas *notat.* Præf. *p.* 4.

Ibid. *There's One* Gabrias *yet extant, that has compriz'd each*

Injuria Babriæ *fit cum ei Tetraſticha quæ vulgo exſtant*

each Fable in four Sorry Iambicks; but our Babrias *was an Author of another Size.*

Ibid. *There's a Noble Fable of his yet preserv'd at the End of* Gabrias, *of the Swallow and the Nightingale.*

Ibid. Suidas *brings many Quotations out of him as this,* &c.

Sect. VI. Here Dr *Bentley* has the Ingenuity to own his acquaintance with *Neveletus*, where he takes little or nothing out of him.

Sect. VII. *That they are recenter than even* Babrius *I discover'd by this means; I observ'd in 'em several Passages, that were not of a piece with the rest, but had a Turn and Composition plainly Poetical; as in the* CCLXIIId *Fable, which begins thus,* Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα χωλὸς ἑστήκει: *This I saw was a Choliambic Verse, and I presently suspected that the Writer had taken it from* Babrius: *whence it evi-*

adscribuntur, quæ Babriam *pro suis agnoscere puderet.*

Id. ibid.

At in τετρασίχοις *illis ne unicus quidam Scazon præterquam in ultimâ Fabulâ* τοῦ χελιδόνος καὶ ἀηδόνος; *quæ sola restat naufragii tabula.*

Id. ibid.

Ex pluribus Babriæ *Fragmentis quæ extant apud* Suidam, *nonnulla congeram*, &c. and then he gives us 14 Verses of *Babrius*, collected from *Suidas*.

Nev. Not. ad Fab. CCLXXIII. Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα χωλὸς ἑστήκει. *Versus Iambicus Scazon, quales* Babrias *scripsit, nec satis scio num* Babriæ *ipsius.* And agen, Fab. CLXXV. Ἀρούρη παγίδας ὁ γεωργὸς ἔστησεν, &c. *Redolent hæc ut plurima alia harum fabularum loca Versus Iambicos: atq; utinam extarent hi Versus, unde hæc desumpta sunt;* Babriam *ipsum, quantum video, integrum haberemus,*

evidently appears that the Author of that Parcel did nothing else but EPITOMIZE Babrius, *and put him into Prose.*

beremus; cujus jam Umbram tantum & EPITOMEN habemus.

Ibid. *There's a Noble Fragment of* Babrias *belonging to the* CCXLV^th^ *Fable about the Priests of* Cybele, *given us by* Natalis Comes, Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις &c.

Egregiè verò rem totam describit Babrias: *quod Fragmentum debemus* Natali Comiti; *nullibi quippe quod sciam extat præterquam in ipsius Mythologiâ,* Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις &c. Not. in Fab. CCXLV.

I must stop a little here to commend the Dr for being so true to his Author always, as even to copy his Mistakes. *Nevelet* did not know of any Writer before *Natalis Comes*, where this Fragment was to be met with; and therefore our Dissertator, that goes no further than *Nevelet*, could know no more than He did. However he Ought to have known somewhat more; because he pretends † to have read what *Tzetzes* says of *Babrius*. Had he done as he pretends, he would have found *Babrius* mention'd in *Tzetzes* together with this very Fragment; and that in such a manner, that 'twas impossible to see the one, and yet overlook the other. For thus *Tzetzes*, in One of the Two Places where he speaks of *Babrius*, enters upon the mention of him *,

† Dissert. p. 140.

* Par. 475

Ἄκουσον καὶ Βαβρίου δέ τινων χωλῶν ἰάμβων,
Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις &c.

Sect. VIII. *There is no MS. above 300 Years old, which*

Ex MSS illis quos habui, ne unicus quidem vulgatas jam ha-

which has the Fables according to that Copy. — Coming abroad first with Æsop's Life, writ by Planudes, *they are justly believ'd to be owing to the same Writer.*

habuit Æsopi *Fabulas, quas* à Planude (*ne* Æsopi *Vse est*) *scriptas existimo.*
Nev. Præf.

Ibid. *The* LXXVth *about the* Æthiopian, *is taken almost word for word out of the* VIth *of* Aphthonius.

Inter Æsopicas *Fabulas legitur quoq; hac paucis immutatis sub Titulo* Aithiel.
Nev. Not. in Fab. VI, Aphthon.

Thus far I have had leisure to trace the Dr in *Nevelet*; and I need trace him no farther; for These Hints, which appear to be taken from thence are the only ones that he pretends to build any thing upon. Whatever he has added of his Own (if he has added any thing) has been already shewn to be either a Mistake, or nothing to his Purpose. And now let me put a Grave Question to him; with what Modesty, or Conscience, he could tell his Reader, at the Entrance of this Dissertation, that he intended to offer such things *only, as had escap'd the Observation of Others?* when 'tis manifest, that, as far as we have hitherto gone in his Remarks (that is in Three Quarters of 'em) he has done nothing but plunder'd *Nevelet.*

† Dissert. P. 33.

'Tis true, as he wittily observes †, *Good Wits jump* sometimes: however I should think it a pretty Nice matter for the Best Wits in the World to jump so often together, so very evenly!

What he has put together in the next Paragraph, concerning the Life and Manners of

Æsop,

Æsop, with a great Shew of Reading, was already collected to his hand out of *Eustathius*, *Plutarch*, *Agathias*, *Philostratus*, *Pliny*, *Herodotus*, *Suidas* and *Strabo*; and the Passages from thence printed at large in the End of *Camerarius*'s Fables. Dr *Bentley* presents these to us with the same Pomp and Pleasure, as if he had been the first Producer of 'em; and makes no addition to their Number, but by One Poor Quotation out of the Scholiast on *Aristophanes*, and another known passage of *Phædrus*.

When he was mentioning (*a*) *Meziriac*, *Vavasor*, and *Bayle*, as Men that had gone before him on this Subject, it would have been honourably done of him, not to have forgotten Those, whom he was so much more beholden to, *Nevelet*, and *Camerarius*. But I find he's asham'd of his Neerest Acquaintances; and, after such Instances of his Ingenuity, I believe his Neerest Acquaintances will be asham'd of Him.

(*a*) Disser. p. 135.

Our Critic having spent his Small Artillery here and there upon a Fable, without much Success, grows Peevish, and is resolved to be reveng'd on the Poor Monk that Collected 'em, *Plannudes*; who, as much a Monk as he was, never, I believe, gave any man such Course Language from his Cell, as he now receives from Court. He is call'd here *an Ideot of a Monk, that has given us a Book* [the Life of *Æsop*] *which perhaps cannot be match'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonsense* (*b*). As for *Plannudes* himself, I must confess, I have not the Deepest Veneration for his Character; but

(*b*) Ibid. p. 147.

but neither can I think ſo deſpicably of him, as the Lofty Dr *Bentley* does, becauſe I find him well ſpoken of by men of Good Knowledge and Judgment, and even by his Adverſaries Themſelves (*a*). Nay, Dr *Bentley*, I think, gives an account of him, not at all to his diſadvantage, where he ſays, that That Sett of Fables he put out was *of his own drawing up*; amongſt which, there are ſeveral ſo well turn'd, ſo exactly copied from Nature, and built on ſuch a true knowledge of Human Life and Affairs, that 'tis plain he was neither an *Idiot*, nor a *Monk*, that compos'd 'em. This is an Honour therefore miſplac'd on *Planudes*, and which he deſerves as little as he does that Scurrilous Language, which the Dr (ever happy in Inconſiſtencies) has in that very Page beſtow'd upon him. *Neveler*, and *Vavaſor* were a little too haſty in their Concluſions on this matter, and ſpake too largely, when from ſome Fables that reliſh'd of *Planudes*'s Style and Way, they inferr'd that All were of His Compoſing. Dr *Bentley* has taken up the ſame Inference from an argument of as little weight: the

(*a*) The Learned Cardinal *Beſſario*, in a Treatiſe he wrote againſt *Planudes* long after his Death, has this Apoſtrophe to him, Ου γὰρ ἂν ἐγὼ σε, ἀνδρῶν ἄριστε καὶ σοφώτατε, κατ' ἰδίαν ἐν σκιαῖς παιδεύσαιμι, ὅτῳ γε δὴ βεβηκότ' ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ θεωρίᾳ, καὶ διὰ πάντων μὲν μαθημάτων ὁδεύσαντ', ἐνδοκιμήσαντά τε ἐν ἅπασιν &c. *Opuſc. Aurea*, p. 622. *Arcudius*, the Collector of theſe Pieces, and who differs as much in his Sentiments from *Planudes*, as *Beſſario* does, has in his Preface, this Honourable Character of him: Planudem, *Monachum Græcum, celeberrimum Philoſophum, & Theologum, & in utráque Linguâ verſatiſſimum.* And the Epithet Σοφώτατος which *Beſſario* beſtows upon him, is given him alſo in the Titles of his Manuſcript Pieces, Τὰ Σοφωτάτου ἀνδρὸς Μαξ. τοῦ Πλαν. &c.— which ſhews, that tho' *Planudes* was a *Monk*, yet the Scholars of thoſe Times were far from thinking him an *Idiot*.

the Reaſon (and the only Reaſon he gives) for his believing 'em drawn up by *Planudes*, is, that *there is no MS any where above 300 Years old, that has the Fables according to that Copy. No MS! any where!* Very Extenſive Words; 'tis pretty difficult to anſwer for All the Libraries of *Europe*: for, as a Late Critic obſerves †, *Learned Men are often debarred the Uſe of MSS, either by their Diſtance from 'em, or by the Envious Temper of thoſe that have the Cuſtody of 'em; or by ſome Other Sort of Hindrances* ——— as for Example, when they expect to have thoſe kind of Favours *gratuitouſly* done 'em. But ſuppoſing he had an Exact Account of All the *European* MSS, yet how does he know, but that there may be one at *Fez*? the moſt inacceſſible Library in the World, next to that at *St. James's*.

† Sæpe non licet Viris doctis MSS adire, ſeu ob Diſtantiam Locorum, ſeu ob Præfectorum Bibliothecis invidiam, ſeu ob alia Impedimenta quæ memorare nihil attigit. Ars Crit. p. 172.

This was an Aſſertion fit to be laid down by Dr *Bentley*, becauſe impoſſible to be prov'd; and, I believe, not difficult to be diſprov'd: for, as much out of the way of thoſe things as I live, I have caſually heard of a MS, Older than *Planudes*, that has the Fables according to His Copy; *Voſſius*'s MS I mean, which tho' I have not ſeen my ſelf, yet better Judges than I am, who have ſeen it, aſſure me, that it is about 500 Years Old, and that *Voſſius* himſelf always eſteem'd it ſo. 'Tis now at *Leyden*, I think; and might have been nearer, but for Some-body's management. I need look out for no more Inſtances; againſt a Negative, One

It

is as good as a Thouſand. If all the MSS. that have the Fables according to *Planudes*'s Copy were evidently Younger than He, yet we could not from thence certainly collect, that He was the Author of thoſe Fables: whereas if One of the MSS happens to be Older than He, we may be pretty ſure he was not.

As for *Planudes*'s Life of *Æſop*, I can't indeed think it a Book *not to be match'd in any Language for Ignorance and Nonſenſe* *, becauſe in Some Languages I think it may: however, I have no Great Opinion of it. There are in it Several Idle Trifling Stories, told in ſuch a Fabulous Way, that one would think *Planudes* meant to ſuit the Life to the Book which follows; and writ out of his Own Invention for want of Authorities. And yet neither dare I reject every Circumſtance of his Account as fictitious, that I do not find confirm'd by Elder Authors: he might make uſe of Books that never came down to us; a great deal of Good Hiſtory periſh'd in the ſacking of *Conſtantinople*: or he might from the Same Books which we have now in our hands, take ſome Hints, which we have not yet obſerv'd in 'em; and which it would be very raſh and Immodeſt in Us to pronounce not to be there, till we have read over all the Greek Authors carefully, and ſifted 'em throughly. And this is particularly fit to be ſaid to Dr *Bentley*, who, for want of ſuch a Prudent Diſtruſt of his own Knowledge, has been Guilty of a Groſs Miſtake. The Circumſtance in *Planudes*'s Account, which he pitches upon to oppoſe, is that of *Æſop*'s *Ugline ſs*. He had met with a

* Diſſer. p. 147.

Large

Large Collection of Testimonies concerning *Æsop* in *Camerarius*'s Fables; in none of which there was any Hint of his Deformity: and he concluded therefore, that there must, and could be none any where else; and that This was certainly a Fiction of *Planudes*. And now how does he insult the poor *Ignorant Monk* * on this occasion? how unmercifully does he use him? he asks him, *what Revelation he had about* Æsop's *Deformity? for he must needs learn it*, he says, *by Dream and Vision, and not by Ordinary Methods of Knowledge. He liv'd about Two thousands Years after* Æsop; *and in ALL that Tract of TIME there's not ONE SINGLE Author, that has given the LEAST HINT that* Æsop *was Ugly* †. *Isaac Casaubon*, or *Gerhard Vossius*, who had either of 'em read Ten times as much as Dr *Bentley*, would not have talk'd at this rate; because Neither of 'em, as Learned as They were, had read All that was written, or remember'd all they had read. But Dr *Bentley*, in the strength of *Camerarius*'s Collections, is positive that not ONE SINGLE Author before *Planudes*'s time, has given the LEAST HINT of *Æsop*'s Ugliness. If he would not be Angry, I would venture, out of my small Stock of Reading to supply him with One, and Him an Author of great Note, *Eustathius*; who in the beginning of his Comment on the *Odyssees* (*p.* 17.) derives the word Ἄισωπος from ἄιθω, ἄισω, τὸ λάμπω, and ὠψ. ἐξοῦ, says he, Ἄισωπος ἀντιφραστικῶς. I contend not for the Goodness of the Etymology, let it shift for it self: but it is evidently built on a Supposition that *Æsop* was Ugly; and

(b) Disser. p. 149.

† Ibid.

and implys, that That Opinion was Common in *Eustathius*'s time, that is, about *Two hundred* Years before *Planudes* was born. Doubtless, that Learned *Parecbolist* (to speak in Dr *Bentley*'s Phrase) could have produc'd Authorities enough for this Opinion, tho' they are since lost: however He himself is a sufficient Authority to Us in the point, since he is not, as far as I can find, expresly contradicted in it by any One Antient Writer; at least, he must be allow'd to screen *Planudes* from the Imputation of having invented this Particular to the Dishonour of *Æsop*: which he was so far from doing, that we have reason to think he might have this very passage of *Eustathius* in his Eye, where he tells us, that Αἴσωπος and Αἰθίοψ are the same (*a*), and that *Æsop* took his Name from his Ugliness. The Groundwork of this Story then *Planudes* had either from *Eustathius*, or from some Elder Account, which both *Eustathius* and He equally transcrib'd; and upon this Groundwork it is probable he enlarg'd, in his Fanciful Way; and being satisfied that *Æsop* was Ugly in the main, was resolv'd to make him as Ugly as he could possibly, and to dress up a Monster in all imaginable Kind of Deformity.

(*a*) Πρόχειλος, μέλας, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἔτυχε, τ' αὐτὸν γὰρ Αἴσωπος τῷ Αἰθίοπι· Vit. Æs. in initio. Planudes *here intimates the same Derivation of* Αἴσωπος *with* Eustathius, *that is, as to the Words themselves, from whence it comes, tho' he takes* αἴθω *in the Sense of* Uro, *and not of* Splendeo; *which he thinks the Easier Etymology, as needing no* Antiphrasis *to justifie it.*

Whether there be any Author, besides *Eustathius*, extant, who has made express mention of *Æsop*'s Ugliness, I am not now at leisure to enquire: sure I am there are in other Wri-

Writers Remote Hints and Intimations of this Matter, such as may fairly be suppos'd to imply it. When, in *Plutarch*'s Feast, one of the Guests thus rallies *Æsop*, καὶ τυφὴ βραδὺς, καὶ ἡμίονον τρέχεις, he seems to reflect upon his Ill-shape and Unweildiness. *Lucian*, in his *Vera Historia* says, they us'd *Æsop* in *the Fortunate Islands* for a Γελωτοποιὸς, a *Buffoon*, or *Jester*, one that *made 'em Sport* (*a*); meaning I suppose that he did it as well by his Person and Outside, as by his Ingenious and Divertive Fables; and indeed rather by the First than the Latter: for his Fables, of themselves, tho' they entertain and please us extreamly, yet do they not give us that sort of pleasure which causes Laughter. *Dion Chrysostome* therefore, in the Passage produc'd by Dr *Bentley*, seems to distinguish between the τὸ γελοῖον of *Æsop*, and his μῦθοι· ἠνείχοντο αὐτὸν, says he, ἡδόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις, implying, I think, that the One was not exactly the same with the Other. 'Tis true, Every-body knows, that the *Æsopic* Fables were after *Æsop*'s time frequently call'd γελοῖα by the Greek Writers, and from thence *Ridicula* by *Avienus*: but 'tis not unlikely that the Original of this Use of the Word was from something Ridiculous in the Gesture, Look, and Mimical Wit of *Æsop* that accompanied 'em, when he first told 'em; rather than from the Structure of the Fable it self, which does not seem contriv'd to operate that way. I am willing to think therefore that the Name usually given to these Fables

(*a*) Παρὰ καὶ Αἴσωπος ὁ Φρύξ· τούτῳ δὲ ὅσα καὶ Γελωτοποιῷ χρῶνται. p. 397.

bles, Γελοῖα, and the Office of Γελωτοποιὸς ascrib'd to *Æsop*, carry in 'em some small Hint of *Æsop*'s Ugliness; for nothing is so Divertive, or raises Laughter so much as Deformity, especially when Wit goes along with it. We may observe therefore, that when *Homer* has a mind to excite this Light Passion in his Serious Poem, he does it by the means of an Ugly Man (*), and an Ugly God (†); *Thersites* and *Vulcan* are, as I remember, the only Two Γελωτοποιοὶ in the whole Iliad; the One on Earth, and the Other in Heaven.

'Tis dangerous conversing long with Dr *Bentley*; for I find I have slip'd here; e're I was aware, into his manner of arguing: however, in this I will still differ from him, that I offer these things as slight Guesses only, without laying any manner of Stress upon 'em. I need 'em not, in order to shew the Dr his Error, and this is not a place to do justice to the Argument: *Eustathius*'s Single Testimony, without other Help, is sufficient to bring Confusion on our assuming Critic, who challeng'd Me, and all the World, to produce *One Single* Author before *Planudes*, that had given the *Least Hint* that *Æsop* was Ugly.

Vavasor, who started this thought to him (for This too is one of the Things *that have escap'd the Observation of Others*) mentions it with

(*) Ἀλλ' ὅ, τοὶ εἴσαιτο γελοίϊον Ἀργείοισιν
Ἔμμεναι· αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθεν. Il. β. 215.
Upon which *Eustathius*, ὁ Θερσίτης παναισχὴς ὤν, καὶ αὐτόθεν γέλωτα προκαλούμενος·

(†) Ἄσβεστος δ' ἄρ' ἐνῶρτο γέλως μακάρσι θεοῖσιν
Ὡς ἴδον Ἥφαιστον ἐν δώμασι πυνύοντα· Il. α. 599.

with Diſtruſt, and as a Suſpicion only; *Æſop*, (ſays he) *was the Picture of* Homer's *Therſites; unleſs Here too* Planudes *has impos'd upon us* (p. 25). Had Our Critic, when he took the Hint it ſelf from *Vavaſor*, taken alſo his Wary way of propoſing it, he might have ſav'd himſelf the Shame of being confuted: but it was a proper Occaſion for Dr *Bentley* to be Peremptory, when even a *Jeſuit* was Modeſt.

Therſitem Homericum referebat *Æſopus* oris habitu, & reliquâ facie, niſi & hic quoque imponit *Planudes*.

The Method he has taken of improving *Vavaſor*'s Suſpicion into a Demonſtration, is, by running over *Camerarius*'s Teſtimonies, and ſhewing, that in None of 'em there is any account of *Æſop*'s Deformity, and that moſt of 'em are (as he thinks) inconſiſtent with it. The Learning here is not his Own, but the Logic moſt certainly is; for I dare ſay, never any man ſo reaſon'd before him. I will give the Reader ſome account of it, after I have deſir'd him to remember, that the Point in Debate between Dr *Bentley* and the World, is, not whether *Æſop* was Ugly to that Degree *Planudes* has merrily repreſented him to be (No-body was ever Silly enough to imagine it, nor did *Planudes* himſelf dream of being thus far credited): but the Diſpute is, in general, whether *Æſop* were Ugly, or not? Our Critic denies that he was, in Vertue of his Old Argument, *the Silence and Pretermiſſion of Authors*; and the Sum of whatever he has ſaid on this occaſion comes to thus much. "It does "not appear from Ancient Authors, that he "was *a Lump of Deformity*, and a *Scarecrow*; "*therefore* it is *certain*, he was not any ways

" deform'd; and therefore it is *probable* he
(a) P.157. " was very handsome (*a*). His Particulars are
" as follow.

In Plutarch's Convivium, *No-body*, he says, *drolls on* Æsop's *Ugly Face, which could hardly*
(b) P.149. *have escap'd, if he had such an Ill one* (*b*). I own No-body there drolls on *the Mien of his Face* (to use a *Bentleyism*); but the Mien of his Body, and his Natural Unweildiness, I have shewn to be touch'd on: and their mentioning any One Instance of his Ugliness, is as sure a Sign of his being Ugly, as if they had reckon'd up All. Had *Æsop* been so very Handsome as
(c) P.157. Dr *Bentley* tells us he was (*c*), the τύνη βραδὺς καὶ ἡμίονον τρέχεις of *Chilo* had been a Piece of Raillery very ill apply'd.

But " *Philostratus* has given us in two Books
" a Description of a Gallery of Pictures, One
" of which is *Æsop*, with a Chorus of Ani-
" mals about him. There he is represented
" smiling, and looking toward the Ground in
" a Posture of Thought, but not a Word of
" his Deformity; which, were it true, must
" needs have been touch'd on in an account
(d) P.149, 150. " of a Picture (*d*). The Dr imposes upon us; the Picture he mentions is not design'd to represent *Æsop*, but *The Fables*; and by Their
* Μῦθοι. Name it is call'd *. In it, indeed *Æsop* has a Place; and he is so far describ'd there as *Philostratus* had need of him, to express the Subject of his Piece; to have gone farther would have been an Impertinence, utterly inconsistent with *Philostratus*'s Character, who is a Short Writer, and exactly proper in his Circumstances. His Words are, Æsop *seems there, as*

if

if he were actually framing a Fable; His Smiling Face, and his Eyes fix'd upon the Earth, declare as much: the Painter knew very well that Fables are the Work only of Eaſie Minds *. Would the Dr have had a Particular of *Æſop*'s Deformities inſerted here? to what purpoſe? when in the very mention of his Name they were ſufficiently underſtood; and would have been of no manner of uſe towards imprinting an image of that Thoughtful Poſture of *Æſop* the Artiſt chiefly deſign'd to expreſs.

* Ὁ γὰρ δι-
μαί πνα
ὑφαίνει μῦ-
θον· τὸ γὰρ
μειδίαμα
τὸ πρόσω-
πον, καὶ οἱ
ὀφθαλμοὶ
κάτω τῆς
γῆς ἐστῶτες
τῶτο δηλοῦσιν· οἶδεν ὁ ζωγράφος, ὅτι αἱ τῶν μύθων ποιήσεις ἀνειμένης τῆς ψυχῆς εἰσίν. Εικ. γ'.

Philoſtratus's Intention was, to deſcribe a Gallery of Pleaſure, hung round with fine and delightful Paintings: in his Account of One of theſe, he had occaſion to mention *Æſop*, and with good Judgment omitted thoſe Particulars in his Deſcription of him which were neither Taking to the Eye, nor at all Inſtructive, with relation to his Deſign in introducing him. Dr *Bentley*, I find, would have been improper enough to have deſcrib'd him *Capape* on this occaſion; but *Philoſtratus*, tho' a Sophiſt, knew better. There is a Like piece of Addreſs obſervable in his Firſt Picture, where *Vulcan*'s Engagement with *Scamander*, and his Victory over him is repreſented out of *Homer*; and which, I ſuppoſe, he plac'd in the Front of his Book, for the Honour of *Lemnos*, his Native Iſland: And for the Honour of That too, and to make his Draught perfectly pleaſing, he gives us a *Vul-*

can as handsome, for ought appears to the contrary, as any Figure in his Gallery. Indeed he Ingeniously excuses the God's not appearing to be Lame, by saying, that the Rapid Motion, with which he seems to come from Heaven to the Combat with *Scamander*, must be suppos'd to cover that Defect: But he intimates nothing of his Other Deformities; tho' *Vulcan* was, according to the Poet's (†) account of him, as Ugly every way as *Æsop* was, according to *Planudes*.

This, I hope, sufficiently accounts for *Philostratus*'s Omission; and as for the *Statue* erected to *Æsop*, at *Athens*, and made by the fam'd hand of *Lysippus*, it will be no argument of his Handsomness, till the Dr can prove, that this was an Honour done to Handsome Men only; which it will be no Easie Matter to do, because there is an Unquestionable Instance of a Statue, made by this very *Lysippus*, and erected by order of the *Athenians*, to the Memory of a Man, full as Ugly as we need allow *Æsop* to have been: I will give it the Dr immediately, e're I part with this Argument.

The Greeks, he says, *have several Proverbs about Deform'd Persons*, *as* Θερσίτειον βλέμμα, εἰδεχθὴς Κορυδεὺς, &c. *but none upon* Æsop (*a*). All that follows from hence, is, that *Æsop* was not *Ugly to a Proverb*; which I willingly grant him, and am ready to leave *Planudes*'s account as

(*a*) P. 150, 151.

(†) Ἦ, καὶ ἀπ' ἀκμοθέτοιο ΠΕΛΩΡ ΑΙΗΤΟΝ ἀνέστη, Χωλεύων· ὑπὸ δὲ κνῆμαι ῥώοντο ἀραιαί &c.

Il. *p.* 410.

as far as this comes to: but he might be Ugly enough for all that; several have been so, that were never made Sayings of: I know Some, at this day, who Write as Uglily as ever *Æsop* Look'd; but their Style is not yet got into a Proverb, tho' perhaps hereafter it may; and therefore This instance I will not insist on.

Agen, *Æsop*, he tells us, was *Crœsus*'s Ambassador to *Delphi* (*a*): he means, that he was sent of an Errand by him * thither; for such Mighty Monarchs as *Crœsus* did not use to make Other Mens Slaves, Their Ambassadors. But let his Title be as Glorious as the Dr pleases, his Person might nevertheless be Contemptible; unless the Dr can prove, that the *Delphians* were as Nice of Temper as the *Turks*, and would pay no Regard to the Public Minister of a Prince, unless he were Tall and Comely. Whatever *Æsop*'s Person, or his Character were, They shew'd, I am sure, no great Veneration for Either, when they tumbl'd him down their Precipice.

(*a*) Ibid.

* ἐτύγχανεν ἀπεσταλμένος, *says* Plutarch, *in* Conviv. *if that piece may be allow'd to be quoted seriously for good History.*

After all, the Dr's Reasoning upon this Circumstance must be allow'd to be Just; if *Æsop* were Short and Ugly, it is plain, as he pleasantly observes, that he could never make a *Proper* Ambassador.

There is another Objection drawn from *Æsop*'s being a *Polite Courtier*, and a Man of Address: what if he were? Many, I suppose, have been so, who were no Beauties! Yes, but he was so, to that degree, as to *rebuke* Solon *for his Gruff and Clownish Behaviour with* Crœsus, *and tell him, that he must converse with Princes,* ἢ ὡς ἥδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα, *either Agreeably, or not at all* (*b*). The

(*b*) P. 151.

Thing he said was Handsome, I grant; but must *He* needs be Handsome that said it? I thought Ugly People had sometimes been as Witty, and as Wise as their Neighbors. But since he has mention'd this Aphorism of *Æsop*'s, and professes to approve it, I must tell him, 'twere well if he'd follow it too, when the Itch of contradicting Great Men is upon him; and resolve to oppose his Betters ἢ ὡς ἥδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα; either not at all, or with Decency.

Dr *Bentley* has yet One Reflection behind in behalf of *Æsop*; he has reserv'd it for the very Last Place in his Book; and we know him to be such a Master in Good Writing, that we may from thence be sure 'tis a fine one. Rhodopis, Æsop's *fellow-Slave*, *was*, it seems, *the greatest Beauty of her Age: if therefore* (says he) *we may guess him by his Companion and* Contubernalis, *we must needs believe him a Comely Person* (*a*). This puts me in mind of his Argument about *Alæsa* (*b*), which he proves to be upon such a Coast of *Sicily*, because it happens to be mention'd with some Towns that are certainly upon that Coast; and which I have prov'd for that very Reason not to be there, because it is mention'd elsewhere, with some Other Towns, that are certainly not upon that Coast. *If* Rhodopis *were extreamly handsome*, Æsop, *her fellow-Slave*, *must be so too!* which is as if I should say, it was impossible that *Little Jeffery* should be such a *Dwarf* as he is represented to be, because the *Tall Porter* and He were fellow-Servants. Must *Æsop*'s Master needs buy his Slaves as we do Coach-horses

(*a*) P. 152.
(*b*) Vide *p.* 124 *of this Book.*

horſes in Pairs? and be as careful exactly to match 'em? Perhaps *Xanthus*, or *Iadmon*, or whoever he was, (for Authors differ) might be a little wantonly inclin'd; and having purchas'd *Rhodopis* for his Own Uſe, might fear, leſt his Wife ſhould return the Injury he did her; and ſo took *Æſop* into his Houſe, who he knew would be no Temptation to her: or perhaps he pitch'd upon an Ugly He-ſlave, that he might be ſure to keep the Fair She-ſlave to himſelf; and made uſe of *Æſop* as a kind of *Kuzlir-Aga*, to inſpect his *Seraglio*. After all, what if I ſhould turn the Tables, and ſay, That *Herodotus* and *Pliny*'s mentioning this Little Particular, is a confirmation of the receiv'd Opinion about *Æſop*'s Deformity? If *He* were as remarkably Ugly as *She* was Handſome, the Obſervation indeed was pretty, and not unworthy of thoſe Authors; but Otherwiſe, 'tis Flat enough to have been made by Dr *Bentley*.

One would think the Dr in Jeſt, when he puts ſuch things as Theſe upon Us for Arguments; whereas He propoſes 'em ſeriouſly and in good earneſt, and fancies he has done wonders in the ſtrength of 'em. To convince him, if it be poſſible, of the Weakneſs and Abſurdity of his Proofs, I will (as I did once before *) try 'em upon Another Subject; and ſee how far they will be allow'd to hold.

Whatever *Æſop* was, *Socrates*, we are ſure, was exceſſively Ugly: Thus he is in ſhort deſcrib'd by *Xenophon* (*a*), and St *Jerome* (*b*): *Flat-noſ'd, Goggle-ey'd, Wide-mouth'd, Thick-lip'd, Pot-belly'd, Bandy-leg'd* (*c*).

* *In the Anſwer to the Diſſertation on* Phalaris.

(*a*) *In* Sym. c. 4, §. (*b*) Adv. Jovin. *l.* 1, *p.* 51. (*c*) *All theſe Particulars, but the Laſt, are taken from* Xenopho.

Notwithstanding this, in that way of *Ratiocination* Dr *Bentley* has made use of, I will prove him to have been a very Lovely and Beautiful Person. I will do it by Every One of the Arguments he has urg'd, except the First, taken from *Philostratus*'s Gallery; in which *Socrates*, the Famous Persecuter of *Sophists*, we may be sure, could have no place: but I shall make amends for the want of This Proof, by a New one of my Own, every whit as much to My Purpose as This is to Dr *Bentley*'s.

Thus then Our Man of Criticism has taught Us to Speak, and Argue — " The *Athenians* set " up a Noble *Statue* * to the Honour and Me- " mory of *Socrates*: had he been so Ugly as " some would make him, it had been kinder to " his Memory to let that alone. But the Fa- " mous *Lysippus* was the Statuary † that made " it. And must so great an Hand be employ'd " to dress up a Lump of Deformity?

* Diog. Laert. in Socrate. Tertul. in Apol.

† Λυσίππου ταύτην ἐργαζαμένου. Laer. ibid.

" The Greeks have several *Proverbs* about " Persons deform'd, Θερσίτειον βλέμμα, εἰδεχθὴς Κορυδεὺς &c: Our *Socrates*, if so Ugly, had been " in the first Rank of 'em: especially when " his Statue had stood there to put every-body " in mind of it.

" He was so far a Favorite of *Archelaus*, King " of *Macedonia*, that he courted him to come, " and live with him *: but would such a Mon- " ster have been a fit Companion for a Prince? " He is known to have been one of the best " Speakers, and a Man of the greatest Address " and Insinuation of any in his time; he had all " the Chief Persons of *Athens* continually about " him, and was ever instructing 'em in the Du- " ties of Humanity and Courtesie, and all man-

* Arist. Rhet. *l.* 2.

" ner

" ner of Sociable Virtues: Could ſuch a Cha-
" racter, ſuch a Station, or ſuch Diſcourſes be-
" fit *Socrates* if he was truly that Scarecrow he
" is repreſented to have been?

He ſung, he play'd upon the Muſic (*a*), he danc'd (*b*), he wrote Verſes (*c*): he was every way an Accompliſh'd Perſon; and his Converſation therefore was coveted by thoſe that were ſo themſelves. He made One often at the Meetings of the *Beaux Eſprits*, and ſate up Drinking and Laughing with 'em till Morning (*d*): Is it credible, that a Man of ſuch Deformity could be ſo Acceptable, ſo Polite, and ſo Pleaſant?

(*a*) Cic. in Catone.
(*b*) Xen. in Symp.
(*c*) Plat. in Conviv.
(*d*) Ibid.

But of all things, that which ought moſt to prevail with us to pronounce him not-Ugly, is, that he was the greateſt Lover of Beautiful Perſons, and the moſt Belov'd by 'em of any of his Age: *Alcibiades*, *Critias*, *Agatho*, *Phædrus*, and the reſt of his Acquaintances, were all remarkably Handſome: " ſo that if we " may gueſs him by his Companions and *Con-* " *tubernales*, we muſt needs believe him to be a " Comely perſon.

His Thoughts, his Diſcourſes were all of *Love*; every thing he ſaid and did tended to inſpire people with it; his Philoſophy was nothing but the Doctrine of *Love*: and can we think he would have dwelt upon this Paſſion ſo much, and inculcated it ſo often, if He himſelf had been ſo very Unlovely and Diſagreeable?

Plato, and *Xenophon*, have wrote Set-apologies for him, wherein they defend him, among other things, from the Imputation of corrupting the Youth of *Athens* by Unlawful Love:

had

had he been so deform'd, as he is said to be, how could they better have clear'd him of it, than by Urging the Improbability of his attempting such Impurities, in which he was so unlikely to prevail? But having said nothing of this kind in his behalf, it must be presum'd that they had nothing of this kind to say.

Aristophanes, who has expos'd and ridicul'd him upon twenty Other Accounts, has not a word, as I remember, of his Deformity; tho' this was the most Natural Subject for him to exercise his Comical Wit upon, and so Obvious, that, one would think, he could not have miss'd it.

I appeal now to any Indifferent Judge, whether I have not prov'd *Socrates* handsome by as good Arguments at least as our Critic has advanc'd to prove *Æsop* so? Indeed, they are most of 'em the very same; only urg'd further, and with more strength (if I do not deceive my self) in the Case of *Socrates*, than our Dissertator has been able to carry 'em in relation to *Æsop*. And yet after all I have said, I freely own, that the Testimony of any Ancient Writer concerning *Socrates*'s Uglineſs, tho' it stood Alone, and we had no Other to back it, would weigh more with Me than all these *Negative Authorities*. So weak an Argument is *the Silence and Pratermission of never so many Authors* in a Point where any Single Writer of Note has plainly declar'd himself, and his Account has been generally receiv'd and credited by Succeeding Ages.

But

But I offend in dwelling ſo long on theſe Trifles, which deſerve rather to be Laugh'd at, than Confuted: I will trouble the Reader no further on this Argument than till I have ſuggeſted One Obſervation to him about Dr *Bentley*'s odd Conduct in relation to *Æſop*. He is extreamly concern'd to have *Æſop* thought Handſome, at the time that he is endeavouring all he can to prove him no Author. He hopes by his Civilities to his Perſon to atone for the Injuries he does him in his Writings: which is juſt ſuch a Compliment to *Æſop*'s Memory, as it would be to Sir *William Davenant*'s, ſhould a man, in defiance of Common Fame, pretend to make out, that he had always a Good *Noſe* on his Face; but however, he did not write *Gondibert*.

Our Critic's Two Attempts are ſo very inconſiſtent, that 'tis hard to imagine why a Man ſhould venture upon both of 'em at once: but Dr *Bentley* had a good Reaſon for it, they were Both *Paradoxes*; and he cares not What, or Whom he writes for, or againſt, ſo he can but advance ſomething which no-body ever ventur'd to maintain before him; and which he is ſure always to manage at ſuch a rate, as that No-body will ever take it up after him.

I have done with what I intended to offer on Either of theſe Diſſertations; and, upon a Review of what I have ſaid, am aſham'd to ſee, to what a Bulk this trifling Diſpute has ſwoln. However, as Large as I have been upon it, I aſſure the Reader, that, unleſs I had ſpar'd Dr *Bentley* very often, I muſt have been much Larger; for his Abſurdities are not yet near

near exhauſted. But I am not likely to be the Laſt whoſe Pen will be employ'd on this Subject; and 'tis fit therefore that Some Matter ſhould be left for Thoſe that come after me.

In that Diſſertation where I am chiefly concern'd, Dr *Bentley* takes his Leave of the Argument, with Some particular Civilities to Me. He *heartily wiſhes he could do any Service to that Young Gentleman of great Hopes whoſe* NAME IS SET TO THE EDITION: *but he can do him no greater at preſent, than to remove ſome Blemiſhes from the Book that is* ASCRIB'D *to him; which he deſires may be taken aright, to be no diſparagement to Himſelf; but a Reproof only to his Teachers* *. I would not willingly be behindhand with the Dr in any Inſtance of Courteſie; and therefore, in return, will, e're we part, beſtow ſome Charitable Advice upon him: the rather, becauſe I have reaſon to believe, that he has very little Advice from any Other Quarter. If he had, he would certainly never have written on this Subject, in the Manner he has done: for I have not ſo ill Thoughts of any One Man I know in the World, as to imagin, that he would have adviſ'd Dr *Bentley* to do as he has done, had His Opinion been ask'd in it. Young as I am therefore, I will take the freedom to do that kind Office to him, which his Friends, I find, either do not care, or are not allow'd to perform.

* Diſſert. p. 68.

And

And the first piece of Advice that I will venture to give the Dr is, that he would know his own Talent; and resolve for the future not to venture upon any way of writing that Nature never design'd him for. Wit, and Ridicule, are either the most Diverting, or the most Insipid things in the World. I have the Opinion of good Judges, that he has no true Taste of either of these, and performs very untowardly in 'em. He would do wisely therefore to forbear 'em; and so he would, methinks, tho' he should have some little Knack at 'em: for *Grimace*, and *Banter*, and *Quibbles*, even when luckily hit off, are not very suitable to the Character of a man in Holy Orders. And to give him my opinion what he is fit for, I think, (if he resolves always to be doing something out of his Profession) that the Collecting Greek *Fragments*, or *Proverbs*, would be a proper Employment for him. He has succeeded well in One of these, and would doubtless be as happy in the Other: for his Genius seems to lye very strongly that way; as one would guess by the Multitude of Proverbs in all Tongues, (English, Latin, and Greek, but chiefly in the Last) of which he has empty'd himself into these Dissertations. And I am the rather apt to think, that such Works as these might thrive in his hands, because the well executing 'em depends chiefly on Two Qualities, which he must be allow'd to possess; Application, and a Willingness to be employ'd in such Sorts of Studies

dies, as only load the Memory, without improving the Underſtanding.

It is Another piece of Advice I ſhould chuſe to give the Dr, that he would, againſt he writes next, make uſe of that Relation he has to a Court, ſo far as to get a little Good Language, and Good Manners; without which, had he waded through all the Greek *Scholia*, and turn'd over every *Lexicon* extant, he would never write any thing that will either pleaſe or laſt. When he is making Reflections on Style, it is very proper, I think, that he ſhould be well skill'd, not only in the Tongue he writes *of*, but in That too which he writes *in*: elſe, he will only make Sport for his Reader, if while he is correcting a Fault in One Language, he himſelf makes Ten New ones in another.

And till he underſtands his Own Tongue a little better than he does, he would do well to forbear Minting any New Words in it; which is the Work of Great Maſters, and a Privilege allow'd only to Writers of the Firſt Rate, who know the Compaſs of a Language, and ſee thro' all its ſeveral Beauties and Blemiſhes. Sir *William Temple* may ſay, *Sufficiency*, and the World will ſpeak after him: Indeed we are convinc'd from ſome things that have come out a late, that there is ſuch a mixture of Vanity, Indecency, and Ignorance, in ſome Mens Writings, as No One Word in our Tongue would perfectly anſwer; and there was need of a New one therefore to expreſs it. But if Dr *Bentley* ſhould

ſhould take the ſame Liberty, he would be ſure to be oppos'd in it; His *Commentitious*, and *Putid*, and *Vernacular*, and *Negoce*, will be hiſs'd off the Stage, as ſoon as they come on: for the Fine Speakers will never endure that a man ſhould take upon him to coin New Words, who doesn't know how to uſe the Old ones.

Another thing I mightily recommend to him, is, that when he next pretends to fix the Age of Greek Words, and Phraſes, he would vouchſafe, among his other Greek Books, to read the *Bible*: leaſt he ſhould happen to pronounce Some Modes of Speech to be of Late Date, which are familiarly to be met with in thoſe Sacred Pages. For after all, ſhould his knowledge in Greek Learning prove never ſo great, yet it would not redound to his honour as a Divine, to appear well read in all Sorts of Books, but thoſe it beſt becomes him to be acquainted with, the Old and New Teſtament.

I am of Opinion too, that it would not be amiſs, if for this Twelvemonth next to come, he read over Dr *Hody*'s *Vow* once every morning: 'tis a Good One; and thoſe who pretend to underſtand Secret Hiſtory tell us, it was made upon a very Proper Occaſion. I will inſert it here, both for Dr *Bentley*'s Benefit, and Dr *Hody*'s Honour; who, it muſt be own'd, has acted up to it always, as a right good-natur'd Man, and an Excellent Scholar.

It

It is my Prayer to Heaven,
That my Name may never appear in the Liſt of Writers,
Or that I may always write as becomes a Perſon
of Ingenuous and Liberal Education,
and a Lover of ſound and uſeful knowledge;
A Searcher after Truth only,
Without any Bitterneſs of Style;
Good-natur'd, Civil, and Candid;
So far from being diſpos'd to any thing that is indecent,
as not to be provok'd to it;
In ſhort, a Deſpiſer of Triſles (†).

Next to this Short *Vow* of Dr *Hody*'s, I know no ſmall Piece that will deſerve his Reflections better, than *Lucian*'s *Lexiphanes* (*a*). If he would read it often, take the good Advice that *Lucian* gives there, of *Sacrificing to the Graces, and to Perſpicuity* (*b*); and ſuffer ſome

(†) *Faxit Numen,*
Ut vel æterno Ego ſilentio inter non ſcribentes deliteſcam,
Vel ſemper, ut Virum *Ingenuum, liberalis ac generoſæ*
Educationis veræque Philoſophiæ ſtudioſum decet,
Scribam;
Veritatis Unicæ Indagator,
Abſque omni Styli acerbitate,
Mitis, Urbanus, Candidus,
Ad id quod indecens eſt adeò non pronus, ut nec movendus:
Nugarum denique Contemptor.
In fine Præmon. ad Malalam.

(*a*) Lexiphanes *is the Name of a Famous Pedant, fond of Hard Words and Affected Expreſſions.* Lucian, *in a Dialogue of his, gives a* Vomit *to him, and brings 'em all up, one after another. His Diſeaſe is excellently well deſcrib'd by* Lucian *in theſe words*; Οὐκ ἀκούεις ὅπως φθέγγεται; καὶ ἡμᾶς τὰς ψυχὰς παρατιλοῦσι τὰς χλιδὰς, ὥσπερ ψιλίον τινὰ ἡμῖν διαλέγεται; διεστραμμένῳ τῷ γλώττῃ, καὶ ταυτὶ τὰ ἀλλόκοτα συντιθεὶς, καὶ σπουδῇ πείθεται ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ὡς δή τι μέγα ὂν εἴ τι ξενίζοι, καὶ τὸ καθεστηκὸς νόμισμα τῆς φωνῆς ὑφορώμενος. Luc. in Lexiph.

(*b*) Μάλιστα ἢ θύε ταῖς Χάρισι καὶ τῇ Σαφηνείᾳ. Id. ibid.

ſome Skilful Friend to adminiſter to him the *Emetic Draught* there preſcrib'd, it would do him a World of Service: by the help of this Phyſick, and theſe Directions, well purſu'd, he might in time become a Sound Man agen, and ſpeak and write like the reſt of his Neighbors.

But if he be too far gone in his Diſtemper to have a Thorough Cure made upon him, yet at leaſt it is very poſſible, and very requiſite, that he ſhould advance ſo far towards it, as to purge his Style of all Inſulting Unbecoming Terms, and Injurious Reflections: for if he carries on this Critical War in that Unſouldierly Way he hath hitherto done, and throws out his Rudeneſſes without Decency or Diſtinction, he may happen to draw ſome Inconveniences upon himſelf that he is not aware of.

Eſpecially he ſhould take care, when the Angry Fit is upon him, not to vent it upon *Great Bodies* of Learned Men. A Single Writer may be trampl'd upon now and then, and receive Correction from his Hand without endeavouring to return it: but among Numbers, there will always be found Some, who have Ability, and Inclination, and Leiſure enough to do Themſelves and their Friends right upon the Injurer; tho' he were a Champion of ten times as much Strength and Proweſs, as Dr *Bentley* thinks himſelf to be. Beſides, Single Adverſaries dye, and drop off; but Societies are Immortal: their Reſentments are ſometimes deliver'd down from hand to hand; and when once they have begun with a

man, there is no knowing when they will leave him.

'Twere well too, if he would think it a point of Prudence to obſerve ſome Meaſures of Decency towards the *Dead* as well as the Living; and not give himſelf that inſufferable Liberty of attacking their Reputation and their Works, in hopes that no-body will be generous enough to ſtand up in their behalf, and ſpeak for thoſe, who cannot ſpeak for themſelves. He has defy'd *Phalaris*, and us'd him very courſely, under the aſſurance, as he tells us, that *he is out of his Reach* *: Many of *Phalaris*'s Enemies thought the ſame thing; and repented of their Vain Confidence afterwards in his *Bull*. Dr *Bentley* is perhaps by this time, or will ſuddenly be ſatisfied, that He alſo has preſum'd a little too much upon his Diſtance: but 'twill be too late to Repent, when he begins to Bellow.

* Diſſert. *p.* 40.

FINIS.

A Short Account of

Dr BENTLEY,

By way of

INDEX.

DR Bentley's true Story *of the MS prov'd false by the testimonies of*

——— *Mr* Bennet. Pag. 6
——— *Mr* Gibson. p. 7
——— *Dr* King. p. 8
——— *Dr* Bentley. p. 19

Dr Bentley's *civil usage of Mr* Boyle. p. 10, p. 7 & 8. (*in Dr* King's *and Mr* Bennet's *Letters*) p. 199, 284.

His civil Language to

— *Mr* Boyle. p. 11, 94, 238, 284.
— *Sir* W. Temple. p. 94, 199, 200.

His Singular Humanity to

— *Mr* Boyle. p. 7, 9, 11
— *Sir* Edward Sherburne. p. 15, 16
— *Foreigners.* p. 14, 15

His Ingenuity in
— *relating matters of fact.* from p. 2, to p. 24
— *citing Authors.* p. 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 117, 127, 132, 133, 150, 169, 212, 219.
— *transcribing and plundering Notes and Prefaces of*
— *Mr* Boyle. p. 35, 113, 114, 131, 143
— Vizzanius. From p. 54 to 60. 133, 193, 194
— Nevelet. p. 247, 248, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 269
— Camerarius. 273
— *Editor of* Hesychius. p. 156
— Salmasius. ibid.
— *Dr* Bentley. p. 192
His Appeal to Foreigners
—— *a suspicious Plea.* p. 13
—— *a false one.* p. 14, 15
His Charges against the Sophists return'd upon himself,
—— *for forging History,* p. 16, 117, 127
—— *for Solaecisms.* p. 34, 91, 178
—— *for egregious dulness.* p. 74, 106, 119, 135, 136, 137, 241
—— *for Pedantry.* from p. 93 to 99, 144, 216
—— *for declaiming.* p. 49, 50, 115, 116
His elegant Similes. p. 11, 94, 97
His clean and gentile Metaphors. p. 11, 97, 188
His nice taste
—— *in Wit.* p. 28
—— *in Stile and Language,*
—— *in Greek.* p. 60, to 73, 203, 208
—— *in Latin.* p. 34, 191, 206, 211
—— *in English.* p. 34, 185, to 192

His

His old Sayings and Proverbs. p. 11, 94, 116
His Collection of Asinine *Proverbs, with an addition.* p. 220
His extraordinary talent at Drollery. p. 36, 73, 117, 133, 214, 215
His choice of weighty points to debate. p. 156, 192
His exactness in Chronology. p. 118, 119, 140, 142, 165, 241, 243
His familiar acquaintance with Books that he never saw. p. 76, 98, 115, 232
His respect to the Bible. p. 22, 62, 63, 67, 68, 121
His New Discoveries
— *of the* Buda *MS* p. 29, 30
— Empedocles's *Epic Poem.* p. 45. 195
His Old Discoveries
— *of* Ocellus Lucanus *being writ in Doric.* p. 54
— *of the* Æsopic *Fables transpros'd from* Babrias's *Scazons.* p. 248
His dogmatical air. p. 97
His modesty and decency in contradicting great men,
— Plato. p. 238
— Stobæus. p. 27
— Suidas, ibid.
— Fazellus. p. 32
— Capellus: ibid.
— *Mr* Selden. ibid.
— Grotius. — Scaliger. — *all the Moderns* p. 158, 159
— Casaubon. p. 156, 158
— Erasmus. — Scaliger. p. 236
— *Sir* W. Temp. p. 27. 92. 199
— *Mr* Barnes. p. 39. 40
— *Everybody.* p. 27. 226. 237

His

INDEX.

His happiness in confident assertions for want
— *of Reading*. p.30. 31. 36.40.62.63.64. 65.66. 67. 68.85.100.101. 107. 126. 205. 206. 269
— *of Judgment*. p.69. 74. 109. 110. 161. 182. 237
— *of Sincerity*. p.76. 84. 111. 127. 132. 212. 214. 215
His surprizing Consequences, p.52.55.59.114.115. 124. 125. 135. 136. 140. 144. 151. 158. 209. 210. 211. 232. 235. 236. 240. 241. 246. 253. 256. 257. 259. 273. 274. 277. 278. 279.
His profound Skill in Criticism. From begining to The End.

ERRATA.

Pag. 11, lin. 18, dele *as*; p. 18, l. 1, read *Library*; p. 34, l. 14, r. *one's*; p. 36, l. 25, r. *merry*; p. 37, l. 12, r. *Ptolemy*; ibid. marg. r. *ortus*; p. 43, l. 31, r. *Dionysius*; p. 46. marg. dele Comma after δίκαιον; p. 62, marg. r. τὴν τε; p. 66, r. ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ; ibid. r. οὕτως; p. 78, marg. r. Δωριέων; p. 81, l. 15, r. ὀυγκίαι; ib. l. 35. r. Ἀττικὰς p. 86, l. 31; r. καταπτυχὲς; p. 87, l. 33, r. ἑπτὰ; ibid. l. 34, r. ῥύπος; p. 89, l. 31, r. *this is*; p. 101, l. 18, r. *unluckily*; p. 102, marg. r. *calamitas*; p. 106, l. 1, r. νομοθέτης; p. 108, l. 24, r. *He has not*; p. 111, marg. r. ἀρετά; p. 112, l. 16, r. *his own*; p. 123, l. 19, r. *other*; p. 125, l. 10, r. *was writ*; ibid. l. 15, r. Ταυρομενείτας; p. 128, marg. r. ἔχε τε; p. 130, l. 27, r. *Scaliger*; p. 134 l. 2, r. *obscure*; p. 139, l. 5, r. *'em*; p. 147, marg. r. Ὀλυμπ. p. 152, marg. r. Θηρικλείῳ; p. 159, l. pen. r. στρόμβοι; p. 166, marg. r. *later*; p. 196, l. 10, r. *a good*; p. 201, l. 26, r. *person*; p. 221, marg. after *habemus*, r. *Cic. in Pysonem*, dele afterwards; p. 233, l. 34, for *unnat.* r. *unlamented*; l. 35, r. *I as*; p. 247, l. 34, r. βεβαίαν; p. 240, l. 27, r. Εἰρήνη; p. 242, l. 5, r. Μυθικὰ; l. 32, r. ἑταιρείην; p. 245, l. 16, r. τῶν; l. 30, r. ἀλλὰ; p. 253, l. 4, r. *pronounce it*; p. 254, marg. r. ἰαμβεῖόν ὅτι; l. 33, r. χύτρᾳ; p. 255, l. 15, r. ὕδωρ; l. 23, r. ἕως; l. 27, r. Ἀνήρ τις; ibid. δύ'; p. 268, l. 35, r. *expose*; p. 270, l. 36, r. *kinds*; p. 271, l. 8, r. γελωτοποιὸς; l. 21, r. ἠνείχοντο; p. 272, l. 32, r. Ἀλλ'; l. 36, r. μακάρεσσι; p. 276, l. ult. r. *Il.* σ, *V.* 410.